India

FOR THE

No. 43. New Series. No. 137. Old Series. WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1898. Registered as a Newspaper. Price...... 2d. By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 225
The Khyber "Settlement" 228
A Parallel and a Warning, by Alfred Webb 229
The Exploitation of the Tropics, by S. H. Swinny 230
Chronicle of the Week 231
Public Meetings on Indian Questions: The Work of the British Committee... 232
The Misgovernment of India: Meeting at Westminster Town Hall ... 233
The Khyber Pass: Declaration to the Afridis... 237
India in the British Press... 238
Advertisements 239-240

NOTES AND NEWS.

We print elsewhere a report of the large and successful meeting held in Westminster Town Hall on Wednesday last by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, acting jointly with the Westminster Liberal Association. Nobody who was present could fail to be impressed by the close attention accorded throughout to the speeches, and the repeated outbursts of spontaneous indignation which greeted the description of the oppressive measures recently adopted in India. The resolution, which was adopted unanimously, was in the following terms: "That this meeting deeply deplores the suffering condition of the Indian people, and protests against the reversal of the wise policy of Lord Lawrence and Lord Ripon, which gave peace and contentment to India; especially it condemns the repressive legislation which has recently been passed by the Indian Government, and trusts that it will be repealed at the earliest opportunity; and it further condemns the arbitrary action of the authorities in arresting and imprisoning the Sirdars Natu without trial."

The *Manchester Guardian*, commenting yesterday on the meeting (of which it gave an excellent report) wrote:—"We hear a good deal about misgovernment in foreign countries, but very little about the abuses that exist in India under our rule. The meeting yesterday, in the Westminster Town Hall, of Indian reformers and friends of India, will not have been called in vain if it reminds the public that our Indian administration is far from being perfect. The chief grievance at present is undoubtedly the new sedition law, of which Lord George Hamilton is the author. A law based on the principle that no one must even speak disrespectfully of the Government seems to the average Englishman thoroughly mischievous when he hears of the trials for *lèse-majesté* that are its practical results in Germany. But very few of us take the trouble to think how much worse such a law must be in India, worked, as it is there, with the aid of native policemen who are too often over-zealous or dishonest. No one seriously believes that there is in India much active sedition in the sense of a desire to overthrow the British rule, but there may be in the future if people are to be continually harassed by police spies for every light word that they may utter, and if the Vernacular Press is to be gagged by so-called 'press committees,' or censorships, which are, we imagine, as illegal in India as they would be in England."

The *Morning Leader*, in a leading article headed "Back to Lord Ripon," said:—"The meeting upon Indian affairs which was held at Westminster Town Hall last night covered a good deal of ground, and adopted a comprehensive resolution. It deplored the suffering condition of the Indian people. It protested against the reversal of the wise policy of Lord Lawrence and Lord Ripon, which gave peace and contentment to India. It condemned the repressive legislation recently passed by the Indian Government and expressed the hope that it will be repealed 'at the earliest opportunity'—a fact which the Liberal Front Bench should note. Finally, it condemned the arbitrary action of the authorities in arresting and imprisoning Sirdar Natu and his brother without trial. We have dealt with each of these topics on various occasions, and cannot discuss them in any detail now. The keynote of last night's meeting, sounded by Sir William Wedderburn in his opening speech, was that the troubles which have lately beset India, far from being a necessity of the case, are largely the result of a change in the spirit of our administration. Fourteen years ago, in the days of 'Ripon the Just,' India presented a very different aspect. It is not too late to revive that better time, but the first condition of success is to abandon the present policy of aggression beyond the frontiers and repression within them. Mr. Bonnerjee, who expounded last night the monstrous law of sedition that Lord George Hamilton has caused to be passed in India, and Mr. Chambers, who dealt chiefly with the operation of the plague measures, showed how dangerous is the course upon which the Government of India has entered. True, the Bombay Government, rather late in day, has given up the most offensive of the plague measures. But the law of sedition remains, the Natus are not yet free, and intimidating organisations known as 'press committees' are sapping the freedom, and therefore the usefulness, of the Indian newspapers. Mr. Chambers told some startling stories of the work of these odious and, as we believe, illegal associations to which the India Office cannot afford to give even the appearance of its sanction. As soon as Parliament meets Lord George Hamilton ought certainly to be asked to prepare a Return showing where, and in how many places, such 'committees' have been established and how many precious 'warnings' have been issued under their mischievous *régime*."

The Government of India has decided to assist the Municipality of Bombay to the extent of ten lakhs. It is not quite clear whether this is a grant or a loan, but after the failure of the city to borrow on easy terms any assistance will no doubt be welcome. Of course it will be immediately asked whether the other cities that have suffered from plague are also to be helped. The *Times of India* thinks that this will depend on the spread of the epidemic: if it becomes general local resources will have in each case to suffice. Apparently it would be impossible to aid a large number of cities, even though India is rich enough to refuse the help of England to bear the expenses of the late war. The *Times of India* also congratulates the authorities that "the practical impossibility of administering plague regulations devised upon rigid scientific lines among millions of people has at last been fully realised by the supreme Government, as it had been previously recognised by the Bombay Government." But it had been recognised still earlier by the exponents of Indian opinion.

We regret to learn from the *Hindu* that the Madras Government has declined to make any contribution from the Provincial funds towards the expenses incurred in connexion with plague measures. In the want of sympathy displayed by such acts, an alien Government is seen at its worst. No national Government, either in Europe or in India, would have hesitated to relieve afflicted towns from the national funds; for if relief can be given it is monstrous that the hardships of increased taxation should follow the ravages of plague. Or is it to be said that relief is out of the question? That excuse could only stimulate enquiry into the actual channels of expenditure.

The Bangalore correspondent of the *Pioneer* telegraphs an account of the successful measures adopted in that city for plague segregation. We invite attention to the following points:—

> The Mysore durbar authorities have achieved in a quiet way what has been found nearly impossible in other plague-affected places in India. Within a month of the detection of the first case of plague, the authorities have succeeded in inducing plague patients and contacts, belonging to such conservative classes as Brahmins and Lingayets, to move out into the general plague hospital and the

contact camp. In the beginning there was positive repugnance and hostility on the part of the people to the Government health camp; but through the patient and well-directed working of the Plague Commissioner, this unwillingness has been overcome; and not only has a large health camp at Mavhalli been occupied by families from the infected locality, but applications are pouring in from representatives of the different communities for sites and for health camps of their own on the high-lying maidans around Bangalore. The durbar having anticipated demands of this kind, has provided a large staff of upper and lower subordinates, all working under the sanitary engineer, mainly for the purpose of marking out sites for the well-to-do classes and building sheds for the lower classes. The engineering staff is engaged in two new extensions of the city and in opening out the congested parts and providing good drainage.

Note the phrase, "through the patient and well-directed working of the Plague Commissioner, this unwillingness has been overcome."

It is impossible not to contrast the successful operation of the native Government of Mysore with the oppressive measures adopted by the British authorities at Garshankar. There the population of the town were ordered to move out at twenty-four hours' notice, and before adequate accommodation had been prepared for them. When the people resisted and threw stones, the police fired on them and killed and wounded many, against the express orders of their own officers. Next a large number of the "rioters" were prosecuted and sent to gaol. The moral is, of course, as we have always insisted, that it is not possible to deal with large sections of the Indian communities except through their own leaders, and with their co-operation. But the authorities are even at the present moment wilfully divesting themselves of the patriotic and zealous co-operation of the citizens of Calcutta in the management of that great municipality.

It is, as we have seen, intended to vest all executive power in Calcutta in a General Committee, consisting mainly of Europeans. We cited a passage from *Capital* in our last issue to the effect that the European traders of Calcutta do not take any interest in such work. How is it proposed to enlist their interest and secure their attendance? By a method unheard of in the municipal institutions of Europe. Every member of the General Committee, it seems, is to receive a fee of thirty-two rupees for attending a meeting, and every member of a sub-committee half that fee. The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* estimates that "thirty-six thousand rupees or more, wrung out of the poor ratepayers of the town, will annually go to fatten the members who are so very patriotic and public-spirited that they will not attend municipal meetings unless they are heavily feed." This is "municipal reform" with a vengeance.

On September 19, Mr. H. Ambler, who had been out on bail, was tried for the murder at Kumerkala of Jagadeo Iswari. He was accused of having kicked Jagadeo, who died an hour or two afterwards, because the man had failed to collect some coolies for night work or to do the work himself. The defence set up was that the man really died from an internal disease, though an assault was admitted. According to the *Bengalee*, the jury, composed solely of Europeans, acquitted the prisoner on the charge of murder, but convicted him of grievous hurt. Now imprisonment is a necessary part of the punishment for this offence, so the sessions judge sentenced the accused to be kept in custody till the rising of the Court, and to pay a fine of ten rupees. It is scarcely necessary to say that the sentence has created much surprise and indignation.

It may be well to reproduce from the *Mahratta* the following statement of the case:—

On the 15th May last, Mr. H. H. Ambler, the accused, arrived at Kumerkela to see some sleepers, which Mr. Lowel, the assistant engineer on E.B.S. Railway, intended to purchase. There were no coolies to spread the sleepers for the inspection of the accused. One of the peons of the accused, named Jagadeo Iswari, who was standing by, was ordered to bring some coolies. The man could not find coolies, so he alone returned to his master. Exasperated at this, the mighty *Sahib* asked that Chaprasi to do the work himself. He expressed his inability to do it alone, whereupon Mr. Ambler slapped him, threw him down on the ground, kicked him with his boots. The same night at about 10 o'clock the poor creature breathed his last. The case was committed to the Sessions, but the accused was released on bail. Mr. Ambler being a European British subject was tried before a European jury. The case was heard on the 19th September by the Sessions Judge Mr. Lee. The jurors, as usual in such cases, returned a unanimous verdict of not guilty; however, the Judge fined the accused a nominal sum of Rs. 10 and sentenced him to the so-called imprisonment of four hours in the Court rooms.

Comments on such cases are superfluous. Englishmen at home cannot read such stories without regret and shame.

In the Indian papers we read that a punkha coolie attached to the sergeants' mess of the Royal Fusiliers was at two o'clock one morning dragged by two soldiers to a well and thrown in. His cries were heard, and he was rescued and taken seriously injured to the hospital. The man is unable to identify his assailants, nor does he know why he was treated in this way. Our readers will remember that this is not the first time that a punkha coolie has been maltreated by soldiers. The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* recalls a case in which a punkha coolie was thrown by some soldiers from a height of twenty feet and killed, his assailants being acquitted.

From time to time we have had occasion to notice the thefts of arms at places near the frontier—thefts which render the real disarmament of the tribes practically impossible. But the latest attempt to steal rifles has taken place, not at the frontier, but at Benares, hundreds of miles away, where the Black Watch are now stationed. This gives a new and striking proof of the determination of the tribesmen to obtain arms, as there seems no doubt that the robbers were Pathans.

The loss and suffering produced by the illegal impressment of beasts of burden in the Punjab for the last campaign are very far from being ended yet. According to a letter in the *Tribune* the animals impressed were placed in the charge of drivers engaged by the authorities, whenever the owners did not accompany them. When the war was over and the beasts were no longer required, they were handed over to the drivers, and in most cases failed to reach the owners from whom they had been impressed. The simple peasants waited in vain for the return of their property, till at last one bolder than the rest made an application to the authorities. Then the Government began to enquire and is still enquiring, while the unfortunate owners, now roused to a sense of their position, are left hanging about the public offices, petitioning this official and that, and still in doubt as to the result.

It may be interesting to reproduce from a Bombay paper some details regarding the foundation of the teaching institution for which Mr. Tata has just provided a princely fund:—

A committee of about a dozen well-known gentlemen who take much interest in educational matters has been nominated, with authority to establish an institute in Bombay, Calcutta, Madras, or some other place, into which graduates, who pass their examination with honours, will be admitted from all parts of India. A similar committee formed in England will select some professors and savants from among those who have made a name in the world of science, and who will be employed at the institute on handsome salaries for the purpose of imparting instruction and delivering lectures to the selected students in science, and all matters relating to the discovery and development of the resources of this country.

Mr. Tata has in very many ways deserved well of his fellow countrymen. His latest act of munificence is peculiarly happy at a time when higher education in India is being starved by a Government not specially interested in peaceful arts.

The *Times of India* takes a very serious view of the increase of crimes of violence in the Punjab, and calls for vigorous measures "unless the tide of criminality is to be allowed to swamp the good work being done in other directions." Among the causes of this increase it mentions that the police is undermanned, that there is too much litigation, that magistrates are being continually transferred from one district to another, and that the Small Causes courts give money-lending creditors a great advantage over their agrarian debtors. The last of these evils has been often referred to in INDIA, nor is it easy to see a more fatal danger to Indian society, a surer nursery of crime, than this growth of a landless proletariat, divorced from the homes of their ancestors and smarting under a sense of injustice; and for this English ideas of law and legal procedure are mainly responsible. As to the evil effect of the constant transfers of officials, the Viceroy referred to it in the most valuable part of his recent speech at Simla:—

This characteristic of Indian official life, the constant interchange

of appointments, though within bounds it may even have advantages, is one that may before long have to be seriously considered. It is obvious that, whether it is in a department of the Government or a district of the country, the occurrence in the course of four or five years of an equal number of changes in the officers in charge must be full of inconvenience, and if it does not make for less efficient management, it must at least vastly increase the labour of the officers themselves, who are constantly called upon to study a fresh range of subjects and the idiosyncrasies of the new set of persons with whom they are brought into contact.

Commenting on the distinguished services of the Sudanese soldiers and officers under Sir Herbert Kitchener at Omdurman, the *Pioneer*, one is glad to see, points out the absurdity of excluding loyal Indian races from high posts in the Indian army:—

With this example before our eyes, how are we to go on denying to the Sikhs and Gurkhas and Mahometans of India the opportunities that with such admirable results have been bestowed in Egypt? Are their military aptitudes below those of the Sudanese of the Sirdar's army, or is their loyalty more open to suspicion? How much longer can we persist in standing on the old formula that the native of India is incapable of filling any position above that of Subadar, as against the opinion of such men as Lord Napier and Sir George Chesney, who held that he is not fitted for higher things solely because he has not been allowed a chance of attaining them? . . . The Indian Warriors' Fund is well; but to open out a worthy career as an incentive and reward for the zeal and devotion and the reasonable ambitions of the Indian soldier, would be an achievement of an infinitely higher character.

With all of which we entirely agree.

Lord Curzon of Kedleston has sent the following letter, accompanied by a cheque for £100, to the hon. sec. of the Indian Heroes' Fund, 45 Pall Mall:—"4 Carlton Gardens, S.W., October 24, 1898. Dear Sir,—I have seen in the papers with great sorrow that the total sum so far subscribed to the Indian Heroes' Fund is very far from being commensurate either with the intrinsic merit of the object for which the public aid was invoked or with the sense of admiration and gratitude that I am sure was excited throughout this country for the gallant achievements of our Native soldiers in the Indian frontier campaign of last year. I am aware that there have been many other and pressing calls upon the public generosity during the past twelve months, and in the multiplicity of claims there are some which must necessarily suffer. But the exploits which called forth Lord Roberts's appeal were so remarkable, and the need for a general fund to relieve or to reward similar cases in future campaigns is so great, that I am not without hope that in the short time still remaining before the subscription list is closed some persons who may have omitted to notice or have forgotten the original appeal may still come forward to supplement the confessedly inadequate totals so far announced. It is with the hope of stimulating any such contributions that I beg leave to enclose a cheque for £100."

The executive committee of the London Indian Society have passed the following resolutions:—

1. "The executive committee of the London Indian Society have heard with deep regret the sad news about the death of Sirdar Dayal Singh Majeethia, and the Council desire to record their high appreciation of his public spirit and patriotism.

"He always earnestly advocated and supported the aspirations and the progress of his countrymen. His death is a great loss not only to the Punjab but to all India.

"The Committee offer their sincere condolence and sympathy to the Sirdar's family on their sad bereavement."

2. "The executive committee of the London Indian Society have learnt with deep regret the untimely death of Dr. K. N. Bahadurjee. His professional eminence, his many-sided activities, his public spirit, and his efforts to improve the Indian medical service, make his death a heavy loss to the country.

"The committee beg to offer their sincere condolence to his father and family in their sad bereavement."

The *Tribune* of Lahore publishes extracts from the will of the late Sirdar Dayal Singh Majeethia, from which it appears that a committee of trustees, consisting of nine members, has been formed for the establishment of the Arts College for which a large sum has been left. The deceased has willed that "every attempt shall be made to inculcate the principle of theism," but that "the said College shall in all other respects be a thoroughly non-denominational College affiliated to the Universities of Calcutta and the Punjab." It is worth noting that the property in the stock and goodwill of the *Tribune* press and newspaper is vested permanently in a committee of three trustees. Every provision in the will bears traces of the public spirit and far-sighted wisdom which marked the Sirdar's acts in his lifetime.

There has been a great falling off in the jute crop this year. The area sown has been less by a fourth than last year's, owing partly to the want of rain at the time of sowing, partly to the low price of jute, and the high price of food-grains. Now the raising of food would in itself be a great improvement on the cultivation of jute; but it has already been pointed out in these columns that as India has to lay down several millions yearly in London, there must either be an excess of exports over imports or the country must borrow. If the trade in jute declines, India must keep on borrowing or must force a market for other goods by offering them at a lower price. So that, since India must pay her tribute, the decline of the jute crop is ominous for the country's prosperity.

The Report on the Administration of Indore for the year 1897-98 (1307 Fasli) is not anything like so full as the Gondal Report, to which we recently drew attention. It is addressed by the Prime Minister, Nanah Chand, to his Highness the Mahárájá Holkar, who may be supposed to know everything, and to require therefore only an outline of events by way of formal record. For ourselves, as observers from a distance, we must say that we should have been glad to read a somewhat fuller exposition, if not of the particular facts, certainly of the objects and methods of policy in the various departments of State. One can gather, however, that on the whole things are going forward satisfactorily in Indore.

Indore happily escaped any serious attack of the famine which raged so near it. Prices were run up inevitably, but "distress in any acute form was confined to the remote pergunnah of Alampore, where the crops for the two years previous had also more or less failed." Alampore contains twenty-five villages, with a population of rather more than 17,000. The people were assisted mainly through the agency of relief works, partially by gratuitous relief, and partially by advances to merchants to enable them to lay in supplies against the rains. The total relief sanctioned amounted only to Rs. 28,000—a little over a rupee and a-half per head of the population affected. The Minister himself, we are glad to note, visited the district on the first symptoms of distress, and put the relief measures in train personally, at the same time rectifying certain weaknesses in the local administrative system. The total of famine relief in the State, however, amounted to Rs. 88,149, but we find no specific indications as to the distribution of the odd Rs. 60,000. The "remissions to rayats suffering from fire" amounted to Rs. 20,262.

Nor is it only in Alampore that administrative reform appears to be desirable. In another district, which the Mahárájá personally reviewed, it was found that "many of the petty officials were found to have been guilty of gross negligence and dishonesty in the discharge of their duties." "The result," says the Report, "was a thorough overhauling of the *personnel* of the Mahals." Very good, so far; but will a mere change of officials suffice to produce a change of moral conduct? It might have been well if the Minister had placed on record the steps he took to ensure that his new officers will not follow the bad example of their predecessors. The dacoities of the year are explained, in part at least, by the prevailing scarcity; "in fully a third of them the loss consisted of grain." It is admitted that "more energetic and vigorous action on the part of the Mofussil Police appears to be called for;" but as prevention is better than cure, these grain dacoities might have been obviated by the measures for famine relief, at any rate to some extent. The convicts and prisoners under trial, lodged in State gaols, seem to be very numerous; and one would like to understand more clearly the causes in operation and the means taken to modify them. The only cause dealt with in the Report is the season of scarcity. Another disquieting thing in this connexion is the statement that "the total number of accused tried during the year was 16,431, of whom 3,526 were convicted and 11,465 acquitted." There seems to be something seriously wrong here, but the Report does not supply the means of getting at the bottom of it. One may hope for fuller information next year.

THE KHYBER "SETTLEMENT."

THE "forward" policy is not dead. On the contrary, it is remarkably alive. The "declaration" of the terms of settlement of the future control of the Khyber Pass, made to the Afridi jirgas at Peshawar on Monday last—which we print on another page—is proof of it. When the Mohmand and Tirah campaigns were before the House of Commons, Lord George Hamilton assumed an elaborately conciliatory air, which tended to soothe the elect. But the future Viceroy, then Mr. Curzon, spoke up in frankly bellicose accents. "Russia," he said "has planted her soldiers right up to the waters of the Oxus, and we are equally bound to do the same"—although he acknowledged that it was not the entry of an invading army which was feared, but only the demoralising effect of a hostile influence, which might surely be dissipated by ordinary diplomatic action. As for the tribes—we quote from his speech on Mr. Lawson Walton's Amendment (Feb. 15: INDIA, Feb. 18, p. 109):—

> He agreed with what was said as respecting the independence of the tribes. But he did not think that we could avoid them altogether. However anxious we might be to leave them alone, they would not leave us alone; and if so, what was the policy to be adopted with regard to them? Honourable members opposite advised non-intervention with the tribes. But it was absolutely necessary to have some relations with the tribes, and three things were essential. We must, in the first place, have means of communication by the main roads and passes; secondly, we must have control of the foreign relations of the tribes; and thirdly, we must have some assurances for their good conduct, for which we have always been ready to pay them heavy subsidies.

And later in the same speech:

> If we were to be successful on the frontier, we must select the lines of communication to be kept open, enter into friendly relations with the tribes, guard the roads, safeguard the caravans, and, finally, concentrate our forces instead of diffusing them.

The basis of these remarks is, of course, rotten. The tribes will certainly leave us alone if we would only let them alone, or deal with them in a reasonable manner. But passing this for the moment, and admitting the plausible air about all these points, we have already shown how deceptive the position is. Where is the use of professing to respect the independence of the tribes at the same time that we insist on fixing such a grip upon them and their territory? "There is one policy that can be pursued in respect of our Indian frontier," said Mr. Curzon at Bolton (Jan. 25: INDIA, Jan. 28, p. 59), "and that may be summed up in a single sentence, 'Not heedless annexation but pacific control.'" Colonel Hutchinson has just shown—we quoted the passage a fortnight ago—that protest as we may the tribesmen do not draw the distinction: they interpret our pacific control as a menace to independence and the harbinger of annexation. The "forward" policy is thus in full blast again. The lessons of twenty years, repeated and paid for in precious blood and treasure, are thrown away.

The declaration made to the Afridi jirgas on Monday at Peshawar is both a disingenuous and a fatuous document, obviously the result of a compromise. "The Afridis, having ruptured their agreements and forfeited their allowances, have forced the Government to take and hold the pass." There is no question that the Afridis "ruptured their agreements and forfeited their allowances"—in a sense. But plainly it is the part of statesmanship to deal, not with a mere occasion of crucial events, but with the real cause. Why did the Afridis rupture their agreements? For some sixteen years they faithfully stood by their agreements and kept the Pass with admirable efficiency. There must, therefore, have been some very strong deflecting cause to make them fail in the duty they had so long performed with unquestionable efficiency and absolute good faith. That cause is no longer doubtful; it stands revealed as clear as day. The various attempts to lead us off on a false scent have ignominiously broken down. It was not Moslem fanaticism; it was not Turkish intrigue; it was not any underhand dealing of the Amír: it was, as Colonel Hutchinson shows, the dread of annexation or control created by gradual British encroachment upon the tribal territory. As we pointed out in our review of "The Tirah Campaign" (Oct. 14), this cause stands out clearly both in the Afridi petition to the Amír and in the captured correspondence of the Mullahs. There being no possible question of the fundamental cause of the outbreak—notwithstanding Lord Elgin's weak suggestions—it is disingenuous to ignore that essential point, and to rest the British case on the mere occasion. The fatuity of the new procedure consists in deliberate perseverance in the very course that led to the disturbances. Colonel Hutchinson has told us, as others have pointed out before him, that the erection of boundary pillars and the establishment of "military posts on their borders or in their midst" is, protest as we may, regarded by the tribes as a visible sign of aggression upon their country and the loss of their independence. The clear result is that we ourselves drive the people to rise in self-defence, and then punish them for "rupturing their agreements." This is the "mailed fist." It is the abnegation of statesmanship.

The Indian Government, then, takes the Khyber Pass into its own hands, and "will control it as it thinks desirable." The Afridis are branded with infidelity and set aside. We ignore the burning fact that the Afridi garrison of Lundi Kotal, in August last year, fought to the bitter end against their own countrymen—fought for us—and died at their post without support from Peshawar; and yet the people who furnished that garrison, and who were driven by their fears to desperate measures, are told to their faces that they are treacherous and untrustworthy, and the Indian Government will manage the business for itself. Well, how is it to do so? It is going to "maintain a militia recruited from the Afridis and other clans, which will be commanded by British officers." That is to say, the untrustworthy Afridis are still to be accepted as trusty defenders of the Pass, the only difference being that the force is to be made more ostensibly ours by a full complement of British officers; nay, "the Government will continue the allowances"—the forfeited allowances; and, while the Afridis will manage the affairs of their own country, "in the Khyber they will be responsible to the Government, and shall co-operate in the preservation of order and security and the protection of life." Really, the arrangement does seem a strange one, in view of the grave allegations against the Afridis with which the declaration opens. Frankly, it is not to be distinguished easily from a "soft let-down" to the Government itself, under the thin disguise of simple modifications of the old system of 1881. The re-arrangement, however, enables the Government to take a distinctly firmer grip of the Afridis. "A fort will be built at Lundi Kotal, with other forts between that place and Jamrud. A railway will be built, if necessary." This is the policy of protection of roads and communications. As Colonel Hanna has pointed out, "the official programme of the forward party in India has always been *posts and roads and no annexation*" (INDIA, Jan. 28th, p. 60). Very well. We have said over and over again all that seems capable of being said in deprecation of this infatuated system. These forts will stand out as so many menaces to the independence of the Afridis. The Lundi Kotal fort will be regarded even by the Amír with sullen suspicion, if not with feelings which may prompt him to unfortunate activity. Of course we do not intend any menace to Afghanistan, nor even to the neighbouring tribes (in the meantime), but no good intentions of ours, and no protests of ours can for a moment avail to conciliate the real confidence of the border-men. These judge us by our acts, and our acts are indisputably hostile.

The Pass, accordingly, is to be dotted over with forts, and the chief "place of arms" is to be Lundi Kotal—a distinct menace not only to the Afridis but to Afghanistan. Lundi Kotal, the *Times* informs us, is to be fortified "so strongly that at any time it will form a rallying point which can be readily defended against a rising, however sudden and serious." It is to be made "a really strong defensive position." It has been "decided," however, "not to station any British troops at Lundi Kotal for the present." So this "really strong defensive position" is to be entrusted to the untrustworthy levies of "Afridis and other clans"! And, no doubt, when it is assailed from without or betrayed from within, the commanding officer at Peshawar, with 12,000 men at his call, will leave it to its fate, and Afridiland will have to be annexed by another campaign. On the most favourable assumption, how is it to be garrisoned by British troops? Though one admits the recent improvements in sanitation, the troops must at least be frequently relieved. The Pass road is to be smoothed down, and a railway—another menace of the most formidable character—will be run through it. What will be the cost? Let Sir James Westland or Mr. Dawkins add up the figures, and then let him look ruefully into his

cash-box. The whole conception of this policy is out of relation with facts. Yet it is held up to the people of England as the height of statesmanlike policy. The *Standard*, while pointing out that there is now no express mention of the independence of the Afridis, openly states that "nothing would be gained by keeping up the fiction." "The sentimental theory that these border warriors are passionately resolved never to be the subjects of an alien ruler," says the *Standard*, "does not square with the facts." How so? Why, because "during the recent disturbances they offered to acknowledge the authority of the Amír Abdur Rahman." As if they had not been driven, in despair, to seek aid against our invasion from their own kith and kin! But we have to wait for the outcome of these new arrangements, and then we shall see how they square, or do not square, with the facts. The *Standard* goes on to reassure its readers still further. "Already," it says smoothly, "there are indications that a less adventurous policy and more moderate counsels find favour with the Government both in India and at home." Does the *Standard* seriously ask us to believe that this Khyber "settlement" is one of the indications?

A PARALLEL AND A WARNING.

By Alfred Webb.
Formerly M.P.; Sometime President of the Indian National Congress.

LATELY, while investigating the rapid advances of the negro race in the United States under freedom, I have had occasion to renew my recollections of American slavery—of the arguments by which slavery was defended—of the struggle for abolition—and of the attitude of slave-holders and upper classes generally towards abolitionists. I have been forcibly impressed with certain similarities between American slavery and the policy many would desire to see followed towards my Indian fellow subjects—between the arguments in support of slavery and those in support of that policy, and between the general attitude of the slave-holders and their friends towards those who denounced slavery, and that of too many Anglo-Indians towards those who desire to see a change in the spirit in which India is now governed.

Not for a moment can any methods adopted or advocated in India by British administrators be compared to the infamies of American slavery. The analogy lies in this—that both systems depend upon the capacity of a white race to bring under its domination one of a different hue—applying the uniting, strengthening and elevating principles of Christianity to its own members, setting them at naught in their application to other peoples. The analogy lies in a common belief that one race is in all things essentially superior to the other, that the one has rights not to be enjoyed by the other, that the one would be justified in adopting any means for maintaining its power over the other: that the one was born to rule, the other to submit.

The Southern planter had to deal with far different material from that dominated or controlled by the Anglo-Indian bureaucrat. Negroes in Africa had effected nothing. They were sunk in what we are accustomed (somewhat superciliously) to term barbarism; rather a condition in which large communities cannot permanently live long and happily together, in which were no elements of progress, no preparation for the close relations into which all the inhabitants of the globe are being brought towards each other. They were fetish worshippers. The horrors of the slave trade and of slavery have proved the means through which the race has become established upon the American continent under conditions impossible in Africa.

In India we have to deal with a people trained in a civilisation, with traditions and records older than ours, who in some respects have shown themselves our superiors. They have come under our influence in the mass partly and because individually they act out many of the apostolic principles of Christianity more than we do.

In the one case the evil lay in the brutal treatment of a rougher race. It may be that milder, though in spirit equally supercilious, treatment of finer material may result in misfortunes approximating those which the maintenance of slavery brought upon the United States.

There is this difference in the contest for a better treatment of the negroes in America and that for a wiser than the present treatment of the Indian people. There reparation so far as possible lay clearly in a definite end—the abolition of slavery. But with regard to the government of India, we have no definite panacea to propose. Perhaps more interest might be attached to the subject if we had heroic methods to suggest. We but desire a change of heart, of attitude, on the part of those now responsible for the government of the country—that they should feel and act like those great Anglo-Indian statesmen who in the past sought to govern through respect and sympathy.

American slavery rested upon the theory that the negroes were children, and incapable of judging as to their own welfare: that they were essentially unreliable. Similar sentiments are now expressed concerning the Indian people, and there always were to be found Bhownaggrees amongst the slaves who endorsed such assumptions, and said they preferred slavery to freedom. We were told by the planters that if they sat a whit less firmly in the saddle society would go to pieces. They were unhorsed, without resulting massacre or servile war, and the negroes are now proving their capacity to guide their own lives.

Abolitionists in the Northern States and abroad were told that they were not in a position to judge, that they had no sufficient knowledge, no practical experience of what slavery was. All Southerners maintained the necessity for a continuance of the system. Few were those holding abolition sentiments who, after a short residence in the South, did not succumb to prevalent feeling in "good society," and learn to apologise for and then to approve slavery.

When in India I had occasion to realise that in the relations between the peoples those personally within the sphere of thought of the dominant race too often actually cease to be fair judges as to principle. The unwonted civility and gentleness with which a young officer with whom I travelled treated all Indians with whom he came in contact, was soon explained by his having been but a few weeks in the country. He had not had time to catch the general tone of his class. "When I first came to India, I felt such sympathy and opinions as you have expressed," said a fellow Irishman to me in Bombay; "but somehow, insensibly, I cannot tell how, my sympathy has deadened, my opinions have changed."

Life in the South was made intolerable to all whites who did not fall in with the current feelings of their class concerning slavery. So is the retention of right feeling towards Indians by Europeans made difficult. It is to be feared that the majority of Anglo-Indians would, if they had the power, adopt measures of expulsion towards recalcitrant members of their class such as the planters used towards negro-sympathisers.

"Society" generally in the United States and abroad was on the side of the slave power. So is it now on the side of the extreme contentions of Anglo-India. Yet the out come has proved that those "best capable of judging" and who "knew all about the system" were wrong, whilst "ignorant and intermeddling" outsiders, who judged upon general principles of justice and humanity, were right.

When two American ladies, without introductions, but a few weeks in India, could expose iniquities in a system denied by its chief administrators, it is surely time to cease asserting the incapacity of all but Anglo-Indian officials to judge. It is deplorable to recognise a man of Mr. Kipling's genius taking the wrong side on this topic. This theory moreover cuts at the root of the capacity of a London Parliament to rule India. (Indeed upon several occasions of late years its decisions concerning India have been contemptuously disregarded and set aside.)

The more the wisdom and rightfulness of negro-slavery was arraigned, the more severe, reckless, and denunciatory became the supporters of the system towards those who questioned its wisdom and rightfulness—the sterner became their treatment of the negroes. Is not somewhat of the same spirit now exhibited concerning the government of India?

The leaders of the abolition movement in the States desired nothing impossible, nothing revolutionary—they were all for moral suasion. Mr. Garrison wrote:—

> Not by the sword shall your deliverance be;
> Not by the shedding of your masters' blood.

Yet Mr. Garrison and his associates were denounced as "abolition maniacs," "fanatics," and "incendiaries." Is not much the same language now used towards those who

never handled swords in their lives and only desire the consolidation of all that is best in the government of India?

The abolitionists were nerved to their task by the dread of the woes that might come upon their country if their warnings were not heeded:—

> Though distant be the hour [of deliverance], yet come it must—
> Oh! hasten it in mercy, righteous Heaven!
>
> . . . . .
>
> Woe if it come with storm, and blood, and fire,
> When midnight darkness veils the earth and sky!

Their warnings were unheeded; the storm burst.

No people or congeries of people advancing in education and civilisation will in their own country permanently submit to be unsympathetically governed by a floating foreign bureaucracy, incapable of amalgamating with them, debarred by physical constitution from permanently settling in the country.

India is willing and proud to form a portion of the British Empire, to receive from without all the material and mental aid necessary for her unification and her government. But her people will be less and less inclined to submit to disabilities insolently imposed and enforced. Those who oppose, not those who advocate, the application of just principles to the government of India are the real instigators of strife.

THE EXPLOITATION OF THE TROPICS.[1]

By S. H. Swinny.

At a time when recent events have fixed the eyes of Europe on the Tropics, Mr. Kidd need make no excuses for applying to that subject his skill in generalisation, and his eminent powers of exposition. Readers of his work on "Social Evolution" may be pardoned if they think the latter greater than the former, but it would be idle to deny that in some measure he is in possession of both. Thus he distinguishes three types to which the relations between the peoples of Europe and their possessions in the tropics have conformed: (1) The Plantation, in which the conquered territories were administered, like an estate, for the sole benefit of the conquerors, and in which the interests of the natives, usually slaves, were strictly subordinate; (2) the Colony, where the object was to reproduce by immigration the civilisation of the mother-country, and so increase her power; and (3) the State, managed in the interests of the inhabitants, usually self-governing, and tending to a more or less complete independence. Of these types, Mr. Kidd looks on the first as having suffered a fatal blow throughout the world in the successful revolt of the United States, and as being no longer on a level with the morality of the age; the second, he considers, can only be successful in temperate climes, however much the French and Germans who have failed to secure a footing for their colonies in those regions may try in Africa and elsewhere to establish them in the teeth of nature; and the third he holds out as fatal to the good government and progress of the countries to which it is applied, as it is certainly an embarrassment to their complete exploitation by the more civilised nations. Having thus rejected all three types as no longer suitable, he proposes a fourth, the "control" of the tropics, which will give full play to that exploitation under the most moral and decent pretexts.

Now as regards the two first types, it may at once be admitted that the one is retrogade and immoral, and that the other is impossible. It remains to be considered whether the third type is really so noxious as Mr. Kidd makes out, and whether the fourth, towards which he believes the world is moving, is not as opposed to ethical principles and the true direction of social progress as the first: whether it is not the mere substitution of a collective for a personal slavery.

Mr. Kidd alleges against the third type that the inhabitants of the tropics are incapable of governing themselves well, and that wherever self-government has been tried, whether in the British Colonies of the West Indies or in the free states of Southern and Central America, the result has always been a dismal failure. Now this is absurdly exaggerated. Granted that government is unstable in many of the republics of tropical America; Argentina and Uruguay, which are nearly entirely outside Mr. Kidd's limits, have suffered from the same evil; while Mexico, chiefly tropical, has long enjoyed a firm and orderly administration. Granted that these states have a bad record for insolvency; has not the temperate, Anglo-Saxon, and moral state of Pennsylvania, like some other states of the Union, failed to keep faith with its creditors? Even if we allow that it is the extension of commerce and not the well-being of the people that is the best test of good government, even then, though the trade of the West Indies has declined, that of Brazil, in which the absence of outside interference has been carried further, has been largely increased: so that the evidence on which such momentous issues hang is, to say the least, conflicting. On one point, indeed, Mr. Kidd is completely misinformed. He speaks of the South American Republics as being governed by a European caste; but many of the statesmen of these countries have not been of pure European descent, as, *e.g.*, the late President of Venezuela.

And what is to be the fourth and last type which is to take the place of this? It is the collective slavery of the whole people of the tropics. They are not to "be allowed to prevent the utilisation of the immense natural resources they have in charge." They are to be permanently governed by aliens. They are to supply the cost of this alien and therefore expensive government. They are to be subject to the immense drain of wealth from their country which government by foreigners and the utilisation of natural resources by foreigners always involve—a drain which has all the economic effects of a tribute in raising the price of foreign commodities against them. They must, in order to pay these charges, labour for their taskmasters; and because this labour is forced by the pressure of the tax-gatherer, and not by the lash of the slave-driver, we are to consider it as strictly in accordance with the best ethical ideals of the age. Mr. Kidd tells us that the people of the tropics are children compared with us, and that we must treat them as such—not, as might be supposed, by training them up to be men, but rather, as some unnatural parents do, by making them toil to supply their elders with gin and other luxuries.

Our author is much exercised for the good government of the tropics. He says:—

> . . . . There never has been, and there never will be, within any time with which we are practically concerned, such a thing as good government, in the European sense, of the tropics by the natives of these regions.

The best modern thinkers have held that the goodness of government consists in its suitability to the stage of civilisation reached by the governed, in its harmony with their habits and customs, their feelings and beliefs. That is not Mr. Kidd's view. The tropics are to be governed as a trust for civilisation by men separated from the people "by thousands of years of development." Nor must he "be allowed to administer government from any local and lower standard he may develop." Thus the government is to remain for ever out of touch with the people, and the evils of alien rule are to become more and more intensified—all in the name of civilisation and "the higher ideals of humanity," but also for fear that the natural resources of the tropics should run to waste, and a promising opening for exploitation be lost.

Mr. Kidd looks forward in the century that is about to dawn to the filling up of the temperate regions, so that the outlet of emigration will be closed, and the trade of the tropics will be more than ever necessary to feed the workers at home; but it is not very easy to see how this function will be performed. If the new world ceases to export corn to feed the old, how will tropical luxuries supply its place? The people ask for bread and meat, and Mr. Kidd offers them gutta percha and coffee. At best this expansion of trade at the cost of the tropics could only stave off the reorganisation of society rendered inevitable by the new conditions of the world; at worst, it would raise false hopes, and imbue the Western nations with the belief that they could always count on the forced labour of others, and so would make them both in morals and character less ready to meet the difficulties of the new era.

But the great practical argument of the author is drawn from the English government of India, which he extravagantly extols. Not for the work of the great Anglo-Indian statesmen who have conferred on India the gift of

[1] "The Control of the Tropics," by Benjamin Kidd. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1898.

English education, and have been gradually training up the Indians to take a share in the government of their country. No! All this, in Mr. Kidd's eyes, is a dangerous mistake. It is the separation of the peoples from their rulers, a separation which all the best Anglo-Indians deplore, that he delights in. He, indeed, is thus led to deprecate interference with native institutions, and to call for the exercise of English public opinion in controlling the rulers; but Indian opinion is to be silent or disregarded. He thinks the growing want of sympathy no loss. The rulers of India are to be in sympathy only with their own native land. The Indians are to be left to themselves so long as they by their labour support a government which exists to give facilities for European trade. And here we may note an extraordinary error, which vitiates much of his panegyric, and shows his incompetence to deal with the subject. We are told that India takes "as much as she gives, for her exports to and imports from the United Kingdom nearly balance each other." Now the vast and continuous excess of her exports over her imports has long been the cardinal fact of Indian trade—the open wound through which her blood flows—the means by which she pays for government and exploitation by aliens, who have no abiding place in the land; and it is elementary political economy that the effect of such a balance of exports over imports does not depend on the particular country to which the exports go. It is no matter to India whether she exports tea direct to England or sends it to America, while America sends on the value to England in corn. The total loss to India is the same; and in a trade in which the exports exceeded the imports by Rx. 35,000,000 in a single year, what an absurdity to congratulate India on the balance of her exports and imports in her trade with the United Kingdom.

But Mr. Kidd may say: if this theory of mine is actually the law of social progress, to show its evils will avail nothing. Is it then true that civilisation tends in this direction? Well, all the greatest names in social science have held that, in spite of temporary retrogressions, the general tendency of society viewed over long periods is towards a state of peaceful industry; yet the control of the tropics can only be carried out by force, the nations outside becoming the recruiting grounds of the army of occupation, and being thus permanently enslaved by military ideals and military manners.

And it is for this that we are to give up our belief in human brotherhood, making the forced labour of the tropics the foundation of European prosperity. Mr. Kidd makes a great point of the commerce of the tropics being thrown open to all the nations of Europe, as if it mattered to the peoples of those lands whether each nation exploited a particular portion, or all joined in exploiting the whole. The naked deformity of the proposal cannot be hidden by the use of such words as civilisation, freedom of trade, and so forth. It means the denial of all that is best in our history, the loss of all we have so long struggled for, the establishment of an insidious form of slavery in one half of the human race, and of a career of domination in the other—both alike fatal to civilisation, liberty and progress.

CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

THURSDAY, October 20.—Lord Ripon, speaking at Rochdale, described the situation in regard to Fashoda as grave and serious, but declined to discuss the question on the hypothesis of the impossibility of a friendly arrangement. He deprecated the use of language likely to arouse a warlike spirit in view of the tremendous issues at stake.

Mr. Bryce, M.P., speaking at Cumnock, Ayrshire, said the Fashoda question had arisen on the act, not of France, but of a French officer who had raised the French flag in a territory to which France had no claim. That explorer would never have ventured to approach Fashoda but for the advance of the Anglo-Egyptian force up the Nile, or, if he had, his tiny following would have been annihilated by the Khalifa.

Lord E. Fitzmaurice, speaking at Yeovil, said with regard to the Fashoda question that French statesmen themselves had declared the title of Egypt to the Equatorial Provinces to be indisputable. As to the question of effective occupation, it was obvious that we were in effective occupation, and that the French were not. He, however, deprecated any beating of the war drum, and thought the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer at Tynemouth was not a model of such language as should be used at this juncture by a responsible statesman.

It was reported from Paris that the French journals persisted in speaking of "negotiations" between the British and French Governments on the subject of Fashoda, and the *Temps* published a note from London asserting that the British Government, having made known its claims to Fashoda, asked France to indicate the propositions she had to set against them. M. Delcassé, in reply, was alleged to have indicated that France claimed an outlet on the Nile, the geographical point to be fixed being reserved. Lord Salisbury was then said to have asked for time to consult his colleagues, and as they were all dispersed negotiations could not be profitably carried on till next week.—The Paris journals commented on Sir M. Hicks Beach's speech generally in an angry strain.—At to-day's sitting of the Paris Municipal Council a resolution was carried calling on the Government, while safeguarding the moral and material interests of the country, to exert every effort to avoid a serious conflict with England. M. Delcassé ordered Major Marchand's report to be telegraphed textually to him from Cairo on Captain Baratier's arrival.

FRIDAY, October 21.—Major Marchand's report was forwarded by telegraph from Cairo to Paris last night. It was only a short document, and contained no mention of Sir H. Kitchener's arrival at Fashoda. It described the route of the expedition, and enumerated the points occupied *en route*, and their "effective occupation" by the erection of posts round which the French flag was rolled. It also spoke of treaties of submission concluded with various tribes, and referred to Major Marchand's encounter with the Khalifa's troops. Major Marchand stated that on August 20 he had abundance of supplies.—The Paris journals continued to insist that negotiations were proceeding, and spoke hopefully of their issue on the basis of France being given an access to the Nile.

Mr. Chaplin, speaking at Sleaford, said that after all that we had done and spent in the reconquest of the Sudan, it was impossible that we could surrender the fruits of our victory and conquests to others, especially when we knew for certain that, but for the timely arrival of Sir Herbert Kitchener at Omdurman, the French garrison at Fashoda would have been annihilated. What we claimed for Egypt and for Great Britain, by conquest, by possession, and by right was the control of the waterway of the valley of the Nile and the provinces usurped by the Khalifa, which had been restored by us to the sovereignty of the Khedive. From that position it was impossible that we could withdraw, but it was also our duty to make every effort to maintain the peace with a great and friendly nation.

Trafalgar Day was commemorated in London by the elaborate decoration by the Navy League of the Nelson monument in Trafalgar Square. Numerous wreaths and other floral tributes from private persons were deposited round the sides of the base of the monument. Thousands of people visited the square during the day, notwithstanding the inclemency of the weather, to see the decorations. The day was commemorated in various ways at Liverpool, Bristol, Portsmouth, Chatham and other places.

Two more cases of bubonic plague—the doctor who attended the deceased man Barisch and one of the nurses who was with him—occurred in the Pathological Institute in Vienna. The patients were isolated in a ward of the Epidemic Hospital, and it was stated by the authorities that there was no danger of a spread of the disease.

SATURDAY, October 22.—Lord Rosebery, speaking at Perth, said that there was this great truth that everyone who studied the Egyptian question had to remember—the Nile was Egypt and Egypt was the Nile. It was an untoward circumstance that in the work of restoring order in this region we should have come upon a French officer engaged, he hoped, in an exploring expedition. But if Major Marchand should not be an emissary of civilisation, but of dominion and encroachment, the case would be widely changed. In the first place a deliberate warning was given by the late Government that a certain act would be regarded as unfriendly. In the second place, French Ministers and statesmen themselves had persistently urged that the provinces of Egypt which had been overrun by the Mahdi were the property of Egypt when she should find herself in a position to reclaim them.

It was announced that Mr. John Morley had consented to write the authorised biography of Mr. Gladstone.

SUNDAY, October 23.—The Yellow-book on the Fashoda question was issued by the French Government this afternoon. It was a document of 25 pages, and opened with extracts from the correspondence between the two Governments in 1897, already published in the British Blue-book, and with an account of the interview between M. Delcassé and Sir E. Monson on September 7. On September 9 Lord Salisbury telegraphed to Sir E. Monson, for communication to the French Government, an intimation that all the territories subjected by the Khalifa passed, after the victory of Omdurman, to the British and Egyptian Governments. Her Majesty's Government were of opinion that this right admitted of no discussion, but territorial discussions which were at present in controversy in those regions, and which were not affected by the consideration mentioned, would be naturally reserved for the treatment pro-

posed by M. Delcassé. On September 20 M. Delcassé wrote to the French representative in London pointing out that Fashoda had been conquered from the Mahdists before the taking of Khartum by the Sirdar, that France had always protested against Sir E. Grey's declaration, and that M. Liotard was entrusted with his mission in 1893, prior to that declaration. He had asked Sir E. Monson why the right of occupation exercised in some of the Equatorial provinces by Great Britain should be refused to France. Sir E. Monson made no reply to this objection, but stated that the British Government, while desiring to live on friendly terms with France could not recognise the possession of Fashoda. M. Delcassé replied that France claimed every right to occupy a point on the Upper Nile with Great Britain. He pointed out that to secure for their Congo colony an outlet on the Nile the French had made heavy sacrifices and had founded and supported several posts in Bahr-el-Ghazal. The remainder of the Yellow-book was occupied with despatches of Baron de Courcel and M. Delcassé, enlarging on the points of the French case presented in the previous despatches.—Lord Salisbury issued summonses for a Cabinet Council this week, at which it was believed the Fashoda question would be the principal subject for consideration.

MONDAY, October 24.—The Foreign Office issued a Parliamentary paper containing further correspondence with reference to the valley of the Upper Nile. The most important document given in it was a despatch from Lord Salisbury to Sir E. Monson, dated October 12, which gave an account of Lord Salisbury's conversation upon that afternoon with the French Ambassador in London. In the course of the conversation, M. de Courcel "stated that the object of the French Government was to have an outlet to the Nile for their Ubanghi province, and he asked for such a territorial delimitation as would place France upon the navigable portion of the Bahr-el-Ghazal, so that no frontier would intervene between her commerce and the Nile." Lord Salisbury continued: "I replied that these were questions which I was not in a position to discuss. I did not possess as yet the requisite knowledge to enter satisfactorily upon the points that he had raised, and any proposals affecting a general delimitation were of too grave a character to be disposed of except by the submission of definite proposals to the Cabinet, furnished with such information as was necessary for the consideration of the subject. He intimated that if I could give him a satisfactory answer on this question, M. Marchand might be allowed to return down the Nile." A little later Lord Salisbury added: "I pointed out to him that, both with respect to the means of M. Marchand's retreat and any other stipulations which it was his object to suggest, it would be very difficult to deal with them satisfactorily unless he was good enough to let me have them in a written form." This account corroborated in all substantial particulars the account given of the same conversation by M. de Courcel himself in the French Yellow-book. It was plain, therefore, that, far from declining to negotiate, Lord Salisbury had expressed his willingness to submit definite proposals in writing to the Cabinet. A meeting of the Cabinet has been summoned for Thursday next.

TUESDAY, October 25.—The French Chambers reassembled, and in the Chamber of Deputies a tumultuous sitting, marked by more than one "sensational incident," ended in a signal defeat for the Ministry. Before the sitting began there were Anti-Dreyfusite demonstrations. It was only with difficulty, and after making several arrests, that the police and soldiers succeeded in dispersing the crowd. As soon as the Chamber had met, M. Brisson, the Premier, who was met with shouts of "Resign," announced that he had sent to the Court of Cassation the papers in the Dreyfus case. He therefore begged the Chamber to keep the interpellations on the Dreyfus affair separate from those on other subjects. General Chanoine, the Minister of War, declared that his opinion on the Dreyfus case agreed with that of his predecessors. He added that he was the guardian of the honour of the army, and that he resigned his office from the tribune. Amid the demonstrations which followed, General Chanoine left the Chamber. M. Brisson declared that it was in presence of General Chanoine that the decision to refer the Dreyfus case to the Court of Cassation was taken, and he commented severely on the conduct of the General in tendering his resignation to the Chamber. M. Ribot submitted a motion affirming the supremacy of the civil over the military power, but declaring the confidence of the Chamber in the army. M. Brisson accepted M. Ribot's motion, and it was eventually adopted by 559 to two votes. A proposal to add words blaming the Ministry for not causing the army to be respected was rejected by 274 to 261; but M. de Mahy brought forward a motion calling on the Government to put an end to the campaign of insult against the army. This M. Brisson declined to accept, but, on a division, it was carried by 296 to 343; and a motion of confidence in the Ministry was rejected by 286 to 254. The Ministers at once withdrew from the Chamber. They proceeded to the Elysée, and tendered their resignation to President Faure, who accepted it. The Chamber adjourned till November 4.

WEDNESDAY, October 26.—Sir W. Harcourt visited Aberystwith to open the new central block of the University College, towards which, when Chancellor of the Exchequer, he gave a grant of £10,000. He made a brief reference to the Fashoda question. It had always been the great and patriotic tradition of this country for men of all parties, independent of political differences, in the presence of national difficulties and dangers, to give to the Government their support in the maintenance of the rights of the Empire. At a moment such as the present this duty was, in his opinion, more than ever urgent. The issues were now in the hands of responsible and capable men; the responsibility was a heavy one, and all ought to abstain from language of vulgar swagger, of provocation, or of menace. The Government, he believed, would be animated by a sincere desire, while firmly maintaining the national interests, to seek a peaceful conclusion of the difficulty.

The Bishop of London presided at a meeting of the Christian Churches of the Metropolis in furtherance of the objects of the Tsar's proposal, and characterised it as an enormous stride in the great question of promoting peace, which, whatever success it might meet with at present, would stand for ever on record as the aspiration of a generous and high-minded ruler. Resolutions in accordance with the object of the meeting were spoken to by the Rev. Dr. Guinness Rogers, the Bishop of Hereford, the Rev. J. P. Gledstone, Mr. Carvell Williams, M.P., and others, and unanimously carried.

Mr. Ritchie, speaking at Thornton Heath, referred to the practical unanimity of the country on the Fashoda question. The Government did not mean to recede from the position they had taken up, and if the French Government would withdraw Major Marchand, a difficult and dangerous situation would be ended.

Sir John Gorst was one of the guests at the annual dinner of the Manchester Statistical Society, and in alluding to the question of Fashoda deprecated anything in the nature of threats or bluster. The proper attitude of this country was quietly, almost silently, to leave the situation in the hands of the Government. Lord Salisbury's position was quiet and determined, and he would be supported by the whole nation.

The Sirdar reached Marseilles on board the steamer "Senegal" early this morning. Captain Baratier travelled by the same vessel. Both were accorded a very cordial welcome, and Sir H. Kitchener, in the course of conversation, described Fashoda as a pestilential swamp, which could not, he hoped, serve as a pretext for war between France and England.

President Faure had interviews with the Presidents of the two Chambers in reference to the Ministerial crisis, but no definite step was taken, or, at least, was announced, towards a solution. The conduct of General Chanoine was unanimously and severely condemned by all the independent Paris journals, while the anti-revisionist organs applauded it.

The German Emperor and Empress landed at Haifa on Tuesday afternoon, and were received by the Turkish authorities. They drove to the monastery of Mount Carmel. The whole company of the Imperial party and their attendants during their tour in Palestine would, it was said, consist of about 2,000 persons.

PUBLIC MEETINGS ON INDIAN QUESTIONS.

THE WORK OF THE BRITISH COMMITTEE.

A large part of the present issue of INDIA is taken up with a report of the public meeting held in the large hall of Westminster Town Hall on Wednesday evening last, October 26. The meeting, as has been stated, was convened jointly by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress and the Westminster Liberal Association.

A meeting of the Ardwick Literary Society was held at Ardwick, Manchester, on October 17, when an address by a lecturer on behalf of the British Committee was given on "the Industrial condition of the Indian people." Mrs. Genny presided over a good attendance. After the lecture many questions were asked, and an interesting discussion followed. It was generally conceded that more Indians should occupy posts in the Indian Civil Service. The need of simultaneous examinations in London and Calcutta was heartily endorsed.

Further meetings have been held this week at Manchester (October 25) and Heywood, Lancashire (October 27).

The important address delivered by Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee at Croydon on Tuesday, October 18, on the question, "Is the Government of India Responsible to Anyone, and, if so, to Whom?" has been reprinted in pamphlet form for distribution at public meetings and elsewhere. A considerable number of these pamphlets, and other publications issued by the British Committee, were distributed at the meeting at Westminster Town Hall on Wednesday last.

THE MISGOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

"THE REVERSAL OF THE WISE POLICY OF LORD LAWRENCE AND LORD RIPON."

IMPORTANT MEETING AT WESTMINSTER TOWN HALL.

SPEECHES BY SIR W. WEDDERBURN, M.P., MR. W. C. BONNERJEE, AND MR. W. A. CHAMBERS.

[From Our Own Reporter.]

On the evening of Wednesday, October 26, a meeting convened jointly by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress and the Westminster Liberal Association was held to hear speeches on the subject of "India: Her Misgovernment." Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart., M.P., presided, and among those on the platform were Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee (of Calcutta), Mrs. and Miss Bonnerjee, Mr. W. A. Chambers, editor of the *Bombay Champion*, the Hon. Mark Napier, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Mr. Romesh C. Dutt, C.I.E., Mr. G. S. Ross, Mr. H. S. Khalil, Mr. W. Martin Wood, and Mr. A. G. Symonds.

The Chairman, in opening the proceedings, said:—We have upon this platform this evening two gentlemen, one an Indian and the other an Englishman, who wish to speak to you on behalf of poor, unhappy, suffering India. Less than fifteen years ago India was peaceful and prosperous. (Hear, hear.) Under the wise and sympathetic rule of Lord Ripon—(cheers)—we had in our great dependency a contented people, friendly neighbours beyond the frontier, and a full public treasury. (Hear, hear.) Taxation was reduced; by a wise system of local self-government the people were given a voice in the management of their domestic affairs; and when Lord Ripon left India on the completion of his term of office, the people in all parts rose as one man to testify their gratitude to and affection for him. (Cheers.) I was myself present in Bombay on that memorable occasion, and I shall never forget that spontaneous burst of popular feeling. (Cheers.) The city of Bombay—the second city of the Empire, for it comes next to London—was decorated from end to end, and for three days the vast population of 800,000 inhabitants made holiday and swarmed in the streets. The people were quite beyond the control of the police, but no control was necessary, for the people of India are by nature gentle, sober, orderly, and law-abiding; and during these three wonderful days I did not hear of a single case of disorder, or even an accident. (Hear, hear.) Surely that was a most marvellous condition of things. (Hear, hear.) What was the secret of this wonderful enthusiasm for British rule? Had Lord Ripon worked a miracle; had he some hidden talisman by which he, an alien ruler, had won the hearts of these millions of a different race? No, it was no miracle. All that Lord Ripon did was to carry out good British methods honestly and fearlessly. (Cheers.) He administered India in that spirit of justice and sympathy which is declared in the Queen's gracious Proclamation of 1858, which is ordained in our Acts of Parliament, and which is I believe approved by you, ladies and gentlemen, and by the great body of the British people. (Cheers.) Now, I grieve to say all this happy condition of things has been changed. The wise and humane policy of Lord Lawrence and Lord Ripon has been deliberately reversed, and what is known as the "forward" policy has been adopted, a policy of aggression abroad and repression at home. Now what have been the results of that reversal of the accepted British policy? Instead of peace beyond the frontier we have had an unjust, foolish, and disastrous war; instead of a full treasury and reduced taxation we have increased burdens with exhausted resources and threatened insolvency; instead of prosperity within our borders we have a people dying from hunger and disease; and instead of contentment we have misery and unrest. To crown all and to make matters worse we have the suppression of free speech, police terrorism, and imprisonment without trial. ("Shame.") Now I would ask, who are the people responsible for this disastrous change in the condition of affairs in India? Surely the responsibility lies on those authorities in England and in India who within the last few years have changed the whole spirit of our Indian administration; who have reversed and discarded the methods which had produced peace and prosperity — the honest, manly, kindly, open British methods, and have set up instead a pitiful imitation of Russian despotism, which puts its trust in spies and informers and secret police. I say this without fear of contradiction—that the British power in India will never gain anything by imitating Russian methods. (Hear, hear.) Our strength lies in emphasising the difference between our rule and Russian rule; and our safety will be found in speedily returning to those good, honest methods of Lord Lawrence and Lord Ripon which are so dear to the intelligent, docile, and law-abiding people of India. (Cheers.) I am not able to speak of recent important events in India from personal experience, but I am glad to be able to introduce to you two gentlemen who have recently come from India and who are thoroughly well qualified to tell you the facts. First I will introduce to you my friend Mr. Bonnerjee. He is a barrister with very large—perhaps I should not be wrong if I said the largest—practice in Calcutta. He also has occupied an important official position as Standing Counsel to the Government of India, and as a Member of the Bengal Legislative Council. I feel sure that when you have heard him you will be assured that the British Government in India has no better friends in India than the educated Indians, among whom he is one of the most trusted leaders. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee.

Mr. Bonnerjee: I am indebted to you, Sir William, for the kind manner in which you have introduced me to the audience, and to the audience for the cordiality with which they have received me. I have no claim to stand before you to-night except that, as a native of India, I am deeply interested in the welfare of that country. (Hear, hear.) I have studied closely Indian politics for a considerable number of years, and I have been from its very inception one of the persons who have taken part in the organisation and in the carrying on of that assembly of educated Indians which the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava so epigrammatically but incorrectly described as a microscopic minority of the Indian people—the organisation which is known by the name of the Indian National Congress. (Hear, hear.) My claims do not go any further; but such as they are you will, I trust, favour me with your attention for a few minutes while I place before you the cause of my country. (Cheers.) I think, sir, I should best discharge the duty which the organisers of this meeting have entrusted to me by reading at the outset the resolution which I am called upon to move. It is as follows: "That this meeting deeply deplores the suffering condition of the Indian people, and protests against the reversal of the wise policy of Lord Lawrence and Lord Ripon which gave peace and contentment to India; especially it condemns the repressive legislation which has recently been passed by the Indian Government, and trusts that it will be repealed at the earliest opportunity; and it further condemns the arbitrary action of the authorities in arresting and imprisoning the Sirdars Natu without trial." Leaving "the suffering condition of the Indian people" for a moment, I will deal with the protest "against the reversal of the wise policy of Lord Lawrence and Lord Ripon." What was the policy of Lord Lawrence? It was peace with our neighbours, happiness, contentment, and progress on the part of the people. I shall ask you to listen to a description of that policy for a very short time, as given by one of Lord Lawrence's greatest lieutenants, himself a member of the Indian Civil Service, who subsequently rose to be Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, and whose name at one time was well known throughout the British Empire—I mean Sir Charles Aitchison. Speaking of Lord Lawrence's North-West frontier policy, Sir Charles Aitchison says: "The policy adopted on the Punjab frontier was one of conciliation and defence:

'By slow prudence to make mild
A rugged people, and through soft degrees
Subdue them to the useful and the good.'

Neighbourly good offices were sedulously cultivated, and while the clans were made to understand that there was no desire to interfere in their territories, they were taught that no aggression would be permitted on our own. The marches were held by a double line, the outer by tribal militia and the inner by the frontier force, both spread over a series of fortified posts. These were to give account of armed marauders. Friendly tribes were encouraged to trade. Fairs were established for their convenience. Deputations from them were received and hospitably entertained. Their sick were freely treated in our hospitals, and their boys were taught in our schools. Their tribesmen were taken into service, and even settled on lands within the British frontier on easy terms. Offences were punished by fines and the demand of compensation; if that proved unavailing, the recalcitrant tribe was excluded from our territories, and as a last resource a force of troops might be sent to bring them to reason." And in concluding his Life of Lord Lawrence, Sir Charles Aitchison says in Lord Lawrence's own words: "Should a foreign power, such as Russia, ever seriously think of invading India from without or, what is more probable, of stirring up the elements of disaffection or anarchy within it, our true policy, our strongest security, would then, we conceive, be found to lie in previous abstinence from entanglements at either Kabul, Kandahar, or any similar outpost, in full reliance on a compact, highly equipped, and disciplined army stationed within our own territories or on our own border; in the contentment, if not in the attachment, of the masses; in the sense of security of title and possession with which our whole policy is gradually inbuing the minds of the principal chiefs and the Native aristocracy; in the construction of material works within British India which enhance the comforts of the people, while they add to our political and military strength; in husbanding our finances, and consolidating and multiplying our resources; in quiet preparation for all contingencies which no Indian statesman should disregard; and in a trust in the rectitude and honesty of our intentions, coupled with the avoidance of all sources of complaint which either invite foreign aggression or stir up restless spirits to domestic revolt." Such was the policy pursued by Lord Lawrence—a policy which gave contentment to the people and which helped on their progress very considerably. (Hear, hear.) That policy was maintained by Lord Mayo who, as you are all well aware, although a Tory statesman in this country, turned out to be one of the most progressive and one of the strongest Governors-General of India. (Hear, hear.) That policy again was followed by Lord Northbrook who succeeded Lord Mayo, and it must be said to Lord Northbrook's undying praise that rather than carry out the frontier policy to which reference has been made he resigned the high position of Governor-General of India. (Cheers.) Unfortunately for India, and for the good name of the British Empire, he was succeeded by Lord Lytton—one of Lord Beaconsfield's "smart young men"—who reversed his policy. The result was war with Afghanistan, the brutal murder of Sir Louis Cavagnari, and the peace concluded with Shere Ali's son, which fell to pieces immediately the people of Afghanistan understood what the Amir was about. I need not take up your time by going over the disastrous results of the frontier policy at that time. Luckily for the good name of England, the Liberals were returned to power in 1880, and Lord Ripon went out to India as Governor-General. He came back to the policy of Lord Lawrence, and he governed India so wisely, so economically, and so much to the satisfaction of everybody, that his name, although he returned in 1884—fourteen years ago—and although in modern times people's memory is not very strong—his name is still revered, and throughout the length and breadth of India he is still spoken of as "Ripon the Just" (loud cheers). But, alas! after Lord Ripon left we in India fell into the hands of the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava, and from that time till this we have had this frontier policy pursued on the

lines of Lord Lytton—with results most disastrous to India. I have read a speech by the noble lord who is now going out to India as our Governor-General, in which he said that Lord Lawrence's policy was dead and buried, and could not be revived. I say that that is a most astounding statement, and if the British name in India is to have the magic effect it used to have in olden times it will only be by reversing the policy of Lord Lytton and the later Governors-General to whom I have referred, and by falling back on the policy which Lord Lawrence put forward, and which was supported by Lord Ripon. By these means only can that object be attained. (Hear, hear.) Now, Sir, are we not therefore right in protesting against the reversal of the wise and beneficent policy of Lord Lawrence as followed by Lord Ripon? I think there can be but one answer to that question, and that is that we are emphatically so. (Cheers.) Next the resolution "condemns the repressive legislation which has recently been passed by the Indian Government, and trusts that it will be repealed at the earliest opportunity." This repressive legislation has been alluded to by you, sir, in your opening speech, and I shall ask the attention of the meeting to a brief statement of the facts. It has always seemed to me that there are two bogies which affect the imagination of English statesmen, both in India and in this country. One has been in existence for very many years—for over half a century. It is the bogey that Russia is going to invade India and displace English power there. That that is a bogey there can be no doubt. (Hear, hear.) Russia has to think of many things before she can come to India. (Hear, hear.) India now is not what she was when the East India Company first went there. The Pagoda tree has been cut down and has disappeared, and to-day India is as poor, to use a vulgarism, "as a church mouse." Consequently Russia will never get anything there at all, even if she were foolhardy enough to try to go there. That is one bogey which has been in existence for very many years. The other bogey which has taken possession of the minds of our statesmen—our statesmen so-called—in the India Office at the present moment is that of sedition. Now I have lived for many many years in India, I have travelled all over that country, I have been in familiar touch with all the leaders of public opinion in all parts of India, from the Punjab to Madras, and I have never yet succeeded in finding out where this sedition is. (Hear, hear.) It is not in existence so far as we are concerned. (Cheers.) It is apparently in existence only in the minds of the so-called statesmen who believe in it. Yet somehow it does not strike the mind of these gentlemen that if there really were any sedition in India it would tell greatly against their competency to rule the country, for remember India has been ruled by England certainly from before the year 1793, or over a century, and if after the lapse of such a period of time England has not been able to win the attachment and affection of the Indian people, then England ought not to be there. (Hear, hear.) But the fact is far otherwise. (Hear, hear.) There are many reasons why the Indian people should be attached to the British Government. Before that Government took charge of India she was in a very bad condition. Her princes were fighting with one another, the people were fighting each other, there was no supreme ruler to be found. But the present generation have never known any Government except that of England. What would be the use of an intelligent people being seditious, and trying in an underhand manner to get rid of the connexion which exists between England and India in order to fall back into the anarchy from which England has rescued them? (A voice, "Question.") My friend there says "question." Well, we must agree to differ, but when he has seen as much of the world as I have, I think he will speak in the same way as I am now doing. (Hear, hear.) But whether it be a question or not, I ask is there any sane man who would wish to revolutionise India—("No")—who would ask that the forces of anarchy prevail instead of the forces of civilisation? I answer emphatically "No." (Cheers.) There is, I say, no sane man in India who would think for one moment of being seditious or disloyal or disaffected to the Government of India. (Cheers.) Our rulers, however, do not think so. Probably it is as Shakespeare says, "Conscience makes cowards of us all," and it may be that our rulers think that they have done nothing to win the attachment of the Indian people. Now when Lord Macaulay drafted the Indian Penal Code, and when that Code was first passed, there was no section in it relating to sedition; the people at that time were not supposed to be seditious. So far indeed did our governors in those days go, they did not think it was necessary that there should be anything in the Penal Code with regard to sedition. (Hear, hear.) This Code came into operation in the year 1862, and remained so until 1870, a year of which I shall have to say a word or two presently. During that time the condition of the people of India improved by leaps and bounds. There being no law of sedition the people spoke out their minds and submitted their grievances to the governing authorities, and what is more they were listened to. The governing authorities and the people being in sympathy one with the other, India progressed very fast, and at the same time made solid progress. (Hear, hear.) In 1870 Sir James Fitz James Stephen, who was if anything logical in everything he did, thought it was illogical—although he did not say so—but this is my interpretation of his language—that such a complete code as the Indian Penal Code should not have in it a section relating to sedition. So he introduced one, and we know it in India as section 124A of the Indian Penal Code. That section remained in operation from that time down to the year 1897, and with the exception of one case in which the jury were unable to agree there was no single prosecution under it. In the year 1897, unfortunately, the plague broke out—unfortunately from every point of view. Mr. Rand and Lieutenant Ayerst were done to death by a fanatic, and these two murders have been the cause of this repressive legislation to which we object in the resolution now before the meeting. The Government of India, the Government of Bombay, and indeed every Government in India lost its head; they prosecuted here, there, and everywhere, in most instances under Sir James FitzJames Stephen's section, and they obtained convictions. But our Secretary of State (Lord George Hamilton) was not satisfied with the convictions thus obtained. Counsel for the accused persons in these sedition trials made strong addresses to judge and jury, and these apparently frightened Lord George Hamilton who had a new section drawn up and substituted for the old one. It was drafted in England and sent out to India, and by his mandate—a word which is now becoming very familiar to us in the East—it was passed into law. Now if there is one thing more than another which leads people to think seditious things it is to constantly suggest to their minds that a sedition law is required because they are getting seditious. Our rulers do not attempt to understand the people of India, and they pass laws which are unintelligible to them and which become a source of very great discontent. Sedition in India means not that the Government is to be upset, but that one must not speak at all disrespectfully of the powers that be. If you say that the Government of India as at present constituted is not wise, or strong, or able to govern, you would be held up as a seditious man. ("Shame.") If you criticise the Government of India your criticism must not be adverse; it must consist of adulation. Our rulers must be considered as having in them the acme of the best wisdom that any human being ever possessed, and if you do not say that, if on the contrary you state that they are common human beings subject to human frailties and vices you would be sailing very near the wind as regards sedition, and you might be taken before the court—for anything I know to the contrary—as a seditious individual. ("Shame.") The one thing in this new law of sedition to which everybody with a reasonable turn of mind objects is that intention has no lot or part in it. However innocent the intention may be, however willing one may be that the connexion between India and England should exist for ever, if you say anything which might bring the Government of India into discredit you are a seditious individual and may be liable to be transported for life. ("Shame.") Is life worth living under these conditions in India? (Cries of "No.") I agree with my friends. I say emphatically that it is not. (Cheers.) You never know where you are. In addition to this sedition law we have, as you have pointed out, sir, got spies; we have got persons dogging the footsteps of those supposed to be seditious. To speak the honest truth, last year in India, according to the people at large, was a year in which there was a reign of terror. Were our great and glorious leader alive and at the head of affairs, such a Bill as Lord George Hamilton's would never have been passed. (Cheers.) Were he alive now and likely in a short time to have the direction of affairs the Bill would be repealed at once. But unfortunately for India, unfortunately for the great British Empire, Mr. Gladstone is no more. Let us hope that his mantle has fallen upon some worthy successor, and let us hope that when the Liberal party come back to power they will take up the case of India—(cheers)—and will not rest until this obnoxious, this unnecessary, this irritating measure is wiped out of the statute book. (Cheers.) If that is done the Indian people will be able to breathe, but if it is not done I do not know what the consequences may be. The resolution goes on to deplore the suffering condition of the Indian people. That is a self-evident proposition, and if I had had the resolution to propose at a meeting in India of Indians educated or uneducated, I should not need to say one word in support of it. It would be acclaimed the moment it was read, the facts are so self-evident. It is indeed true that the people of India are suffering, and their condition is perfectly deplorable. They have just been emerging from the effects of a famine of great magnitude; they are also emerging from the effects of the plague which visited Bombay and other parts of India the year before last and last year, and, alas, the plague has gone back to Bombay and is creating great ravages. The people deserve your sympathy, but they desire something more. They desire your assistance to become free from the trammels of this legislation which has been imposed upon them. Every man amongst you who has a vote to return a member to the House of Commons is indirectly responsible for the government of India—the proper government of India—and I appeal to you all to consider the question of India a little more carefully than you are in the habit of doing. (Hear, hear.) I appeal to you all to take the circumstances of India into your consideration and to do what you can to bind the Indian people to you by silken cords, and to make them happy and contented by doing all you can to ameliorate their condition. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. W. A. Chambers.

The Chairman next introduced Mr. Chambers, a civil engineer who went out to India in 1890, who had interested himself in public matters there, and was the only European who had ever secured the confidence of the people to the extent of being elected by them, in a contested election, a member of a municipality. He was also the Editor of the *Bombay Champion* and, above all, he had kept himself free from class prejudices and had had the courage and patriotism to look at things with an impartial and unprejudiced eye. (Cheers.)

Mr. Chambers: I am much obliged to you, sir, for the kind way in which you have introduced me to the audience. I hope I shall continue to deserve the confidence which some of the people of the country from which I have just come seem to have reposed in me. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Bonnerjee devoted the latter part of his speech to a criticism of the Sedition Law in India; but he did not tell you, as I will tell you, that he may deliver a seditious speech in England for which on his return to India he may be brought before a court of justice and charged under the law. He did not tell you either, as I will tell you, that I can deliver as many seditious speeches as I like in England, and there is no court in India which can try me, I being an Englishman and he being an Indian. ("Shame.") That one fact is, I think, sufficient to condemn the present methods of British administration in India, and to excite your commiseration. (Hear, hear.) In the short space of time at my disposal I wish to direct your attention to the way in which this objectionable legislation is being administered in India. Our administrators there at the present time are establishing in various parts of the country what they call "Press Committees." I am not a lawyer, and do not profess to have any legal knowledge; but I am informed by those who have such knowledge that these "Press Committees" are illegal. (Hear, hear.) Whether that be so or not, at the present moment the Bombay Government are imposing on

the Bombay Presidency in various places certain "committees" which have for their ulterior object one purpose and only one purpose—to frighten unfortunate editors who may overstep the lines of what they consider right and proper writing. We have a committee in Poona—that dreadful city. (Laughter). We have a committee, although I have not not yet been able to discover who is upon it—(laughter)—still there was a rumour of its existence—we have, I understand, a committee in Bombay. This I do know, that we have such a committee in Poona, and I will tell you what happened there in connexion with it, and when I have finished doing so I want, as Mr. Bonnerjee has done, to ask those of you who have votes and who consequently share the responsibility for the good government of this Empire, if this is the sort of action you approve. This committee is composed (I am speaking from memory) of the city magistrate, the collector, the head of the police and two very old Hindu gentlemen. Their duties, as alleged, are to be the means of conveying information to the local press, and of putting matters right whenever there seems to be anything wrong. These are the duties as alleged. But in practice this is how the committee is worked. There is published in Poona a newspaper called the *Mahratta*, a very valuable newspaper, and in its own local circles a very important one. The editor is a gentleman named Kelkar. On one occasion he wrote that when the elder Natu was put in prison, the police who had charge of him abused him, the inference being of course that they had exceeded their duty. Scarcely was the ink dry on the paper when Mr. Kelkar received a request to call upon the head of this "press committee," the collector of Poona. They had a long interview, the purport of which was published in the *Mahratta*. Said the collector: "How do you know that the Natus were abused by the police?" "I saw it in a Bombay paper," was the reply. "Did you enquire of the Natus if they were abused by the police?" "How," was the answer, "could I make enquiry when the Natus were in prison." "Are you sure that they were abused by the police," continued the collector. "Well, it appeared in the paper edited by Mr. Chambers. You had better enquire of him." (Laughter.) They did not make enquiry of me, but as a matter of fact the information upon which the charge was based was contained in a petition from the elder Natu which we had published in Bombay. That is not the only case. There is another case of a paper published not far from Poona. We had had in Bombay a case in which a soldier shot a Native with a Lee-Metford rifle, and the editor in commenting upon this said it was unfortunate that the attention of the Government did not seem to be directed towards these occurrences, which were happening too often. He may not have said it in so many words, but that was the effect of his language. Again, scarcely had the printing ink dried upon the paper when the editor was called before an official and was asked if he was aware that the Government of India knew of this incident and were about to publish a resolution dealing with these scandals. If he was not aware, why did he not ask before he made such an allegation in his newspaper? The third instance with which I will trouble you is contained in a letter which has been handed to me, and which is very interesting as showing how these committees work. There is a paper published at Ahmadnagar called the *Jagadadarsha*, and on July 10, 1898, the editor published an article of which the following is a rather quaint translation. It is evidently a comment upon the fact that a European soldier had been sent to prison for robbing a Roman Catholic church:—

"One soldier sentenced, the Goddess of Justice being in favour of the whites, they (the thoughtful Europeans) do not fear at all to behave unguardedly. Moreover, the soldiers being quite ignorant have not the least cause to fear. Justice being so, the soldiers have hitherto committed serious offences and escaped from them (the consequences).

"On May 19 last one, Richardson, entered a Roman Catholic chapel at Belgaum and did away with 1,100 rupees from the custody of the priest. Police arrested him after information. His case was sent up to the High Court. It was tried before Mr. J. Strachey. The jury was called. There were six Europeans, one Goanese, one Parsi, and one Hindu on the jury. The jury being satisfied of the man having committed theft, the hon. judge passed two years' rigorous imprisonment on him.

"The idea that the punishment to Mr. Richardson will have a deterrent effect on the whites is a mistaken one. The complainant in the present case being a European priest the Goddess of Justice was sitting with eyes open. If he had been a Native she would have fast shut up her eyes. There is no fear of partiality when the colour of the skin of the two parties is the same. No wonder that the result of the present case is such. How would other white people be frightened by this."

That appears to me, as I hope it does to you, a very innocent sort of comment upon a matter of that kind. The writer is drawing attention to the popular belief in India that if a Native is abused or even killed by a European it is very difficult to get a conviction. But on the 18th July, 1898, a certain Mr. Hudson, who is, I believe, chairman of one of these wretched "press committees," wrote:—

"No. 7929. NAGAR, 18th July, 1898.

"The editor of the *Jagadadarsha* is warned that his article of the 10th July, 1898, on the conviction of a soldier and the partiality of the Bombay High Court where Europeans are concerned, was conceived in bad taste, and that its tone is objectionable.

"(Signed) C. HUDSON,
"District Magistrate, Ahmadnagar."

I ask you seriously and earnestly and with all due deference if that is not establishing in India a press censorship. (Hear, hear.) Whenever an article appears which any high official, such as Mr. Hudson, imagines to be beyond the bounds of good taste he, signing the document in his capacity as magistrate, and attaching to it therefore the weight of his official position, sends to the unfortunate editor a warning letter, and the result in this case is that so far as this little town is concerned there will be one less free-spoken newspaper to voice the grievances of the people of that district. ("Shame.") I want to ask you seriously if you think that is a correct state of affairs—("No, no.")—to continue in a country for the government of which you are responsible? ("No, no.") It seems to me utterly un-English—(cheers)—utterly un-British—(cheers)—that there should be a censorship of this description. I want if possible to arouse your hatred and your dislike of a committee which is used in this fashion. When a question was put in the Legislative Council on the subject it was represented that these committees are of the most innocent character. It has been one of our misfortunes that we could never get a satisfactory answer in the Bombay Legislative Council. (Mr. BONNERJEE: "Nor in any other.") I am going to appeal to you to try and induce one of your representatives in the British House of Commons to move for a return showing the number of these committees, where they have been formed, how many warnings they have issued, and to whom. If we get that information, the result may possibly be to put an end to this frightful state of things. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Bonnerjee in his speech said the plague had caused the sedition law to be passed. I think he is right. All our troubles have sprung from that unfortunate plague and from the murders of Mr. Rand and Lieutenant Ayerst. These events gave an opportunity, so long wished for I am afraid by certain individuals, to pass these repressive Acts. I have laboured this point in the speeches I have delivered in this country perhaps too much; but I want you to understand that the riots and the disturbances which arose in consequence of the plague were absolutely unpolitical. (Cheers.) There were no politics behind them whatsoever. They arose simply from the wish and the mad desire of a people frightened to death, to get rid of regulations they did not like. (Hear, hear.) No leading politician, no leading organisation had anything to do whatsoever with the disturbances which followed the publication of certain regulations. (Hear, hear.) But you were told here that political organisations and motives were behind them—("Shame")—and therefore I want you to understand that these regulations were simply combated by the people without any political motive in the ordinary sense. I will try to describe how these regulations acted, and will give you an incident that came under my own notice, and then I will ask you to consider what was behind the riot which followed. In Bombay there are a certain number of Mahometan weavers called Julais, possibly the most ignorant people in Bombay. They never read the newspapers, and never take part in any political movement whatsoever. They are very poor and they occupy the lowest chawls in Bombay. Some months ago it was rumoured that there was a case of plague in one of their chawls, and our wise plague organisers—for we have to believe that they are wise—(laughter)—sent into the chawl of an ignorant fanatical people a young Parsee medical student. It was just as if I had sent into an Orange camp a Roman Catholic priest. That young Parsee medical student was asked to examine a Mahometan girl who was supposed to be suffering from the plague. Can you imagine anything more idiotic, or anything more likely to lead to a riot? (Hear, hear.) This young man went there and did his duty. Of course there was a riot: men were shot down in the streets, policemen were wounded, and two unfortunate soldiers were killed. Still, they got the girl to the hospital, and then they discovered that she was not suffering from the plague. I am not exaggerating. I am only telling you the absolute truth, and I ask, was not such conduct likely to create a riot? At any rate that was the cause of the Bombay riot, and there was not a single political organisation behind it. You are told often and often that the people are very bad to deal with, and that these regulations were put in force as the Government could do nothing else. I am willing to admit that there is a good deal of ignorance and, if you like, of prejudice against these plague regulations; but this I also know, that when the people were allowed to do as they thought fit in plague matters they submitted to reasonable and proper regulations. We had in Bombay a Mahratta plague hospital, and our experience of this shows that the people when properly approached behaved in a reasonable manner. In the centre of the grounds was the hospital itself, around it were little huts or shanties put up temporarily in order that the people might live there while any member of the family was in hospital. Now that hospital, in consequence of the Natives being allowed to have their families with them in segregation, was the most popular hospital in Bombay, and on one occasion when I visited it I saw the policeman at the door surrounded by coolies—a very ignorant class—and was informed that they had come voluntarily to be segregated and taken care of. I therefore want you to understand that when the people are treated fairly, when they are treated humanely and in accordance with their lights and desires, there is none of that frightful dissension and struggling of which you have heard so much. (Hear, hear.) At last the Government had learnt wisdom. (Cheers.) Let it be said to the credit of the Bombay Government, and to the credit of those who administer affairs there, that at last they had learnt wisdom. Many of the regulations which they drew up, and for protesting against which you were told the people of India were seditious, have been repealed and others put in their place. (Hear, hear.) We were told by Lord Sandhurst on a public occasion that many of the regulations were not worth the suffering they caused. That was all the people themselves said—(hear, hear)—and now the Government had issued another resolution to this effect: "The Government of India consider that in view of the attitude of the people on the subject, it should be publicly announced when plague breaks out that no person when attacked with plague will be compelled to be treated by a European or to take European medicines." (Cheers.) We have also been told at a public durbar in Poona that the authorities and the people of Poona have learnt many things during the past few months. All the people did was to protest against these regulations and to ask that they might be amended, and after a good deal of struggle and uproar the Government have issued regulations which practically grant everything they require. But unfortunately one of the great results of the past trouble still remains. They have got their sedition law, and they have got their "press committees," and I am here to-night to appeal to you as Englishmen to have some sympathy with a suffering people and to do everything in your power at least to repeal that law and to put an end to these wretched "press

committees" when the Liberals again come in to office—(cheers)—or when a democratic Government gets at the head of affairs. We say that these "press committees" are a great danger; they are absolutely un-British and un-English. (Hear, hear.) We say that they ought to be abolished, and we ask you, on behalf of the educated people of India, to do your best to get rid of them. (Cheers.) One thing struck me as I came along the streets to-night. In India it is considered an offence against the law to publish a statement which is not true, or to set on foot a rumour which may cause a public disturbance. Any editor doing that is liable to be haled before a court of justice and sent to prison. What would happen in London to our evening newspapers if it were illegal and an offence in the eyes of the law to publish false rumours. (Laughter.) I am afraid many of the editors would not enjoy the liberty they now have. (Cheers and laughter.) You have heard a good deal about the British soldier and allegations that they have misbehaved in matters connected with the plague regulations. I do not want to go into that delicate subject at all, but I wish to say this, that when I came here to-night my attention was drawn to a British soldier who has been in India and who knows the people. He has done me the honour to write me this message with regard to my remarks at the meetings I have had the privilege of addressing: "I agree with everything Mr. Chambers has said up till now and I thoroughly sympathise with the Indian people." (Loud cheers.) That is a very nice message. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Bonnerjee wishes me to say a few words about the Natus. The resolution condemns the arbitrary action of the authorities in imprisoning the Natus without trial. (Hear, hear.) Let me tell you what I can concerning these unfortunate men. The elder one is a man of property and social position in Poona, while the younger one takes absolutely no interest in political affairs. The elder is one of the leading lights of the party known in India as the Anti-Reform party. But we are not discussing his views. When the unfortunate murders took place in Poona on the night of Jubilee day the Government did everything in their power to discover who were the men at the bottom of the crimes. The idea in their minds, and an idea put into their minds and your minds, I am afraid, by certain public writers who should have known better, was that behind these murders there were men of influence and position in Poona. A little while after the murders took place we were told—and it came upon us as a thunderclap—that Sirdar Natu and his brother had been put in prison under a Regulation which has the force of an Act of the Legislature, dated 1827, substantially to the effect that any man who is a nuisance to the Government may be put in prison and kept there without trial. Under such a Regulation Mr. Bonnerjee and Mr. Naoroji might be arrested—(laughter)—but an Englishman could not. ("Shame.") Well, under the circumstances many of us naturally came to the conclusion that these Natu brothers had something to do with the murders; we could not conceive it possible that any body of responsible men administering the affairs of India could have put into force the Regulation of 1827 unless they had information of which we knew nothing. A question was put in the Legislative Council of Bombay as to why the Natus had been arrested, and we were told it was a serious matter of State which could not be disclosed. Then our Chairman (Sir W. Wedderburn) made a similar enquiry in the House of Commons, and Lord George Hamilton stated that the imprisonment of these men was expected to "lead to the unravelling of the plot" which ended in the assassination of Mr. Rand and Lieutenant Ayerst. We naturally thought, on such a statement from a responsible Minister—(Mr. Bonnerjee: "Irresponsible")—that the enforcement of the Regulation had not been without reason; and so we waited. But as time passed on and no one was put on his trial, we came to the conclusion that if Lord George Hamilton had any facts to disclose against the Natus the proper place to bring them forward was in a Court of Justice, especially as we knew that at that time the Natus were not even allowed to see their solicitors, and could only see such papers as the *Times of India*—poor unfortunate men. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) One fine day, however, the murderer—Damodar Chapekar—was discovered, and we naturally wanted to know why the Natus were still kept in prison. Our good friend the Chairman put another question in Parliament, and was then told that the elder Natu had intimidated a midwife in Poona—(laughter)—and that the two prisoners had impeded the organisation of the plague duties in Poona. We at once set out to discover who the midwife was, and in course of time we found that the elder Natu had had a dispute in the Small Cause Court at Poona with a midwife who had been one of his tenants, and that there had been an altercation with her in the streets. We asked if that was the woman whom Sirdar Natu was said to have intimidated, and we pointed out that she had been dismissed by one of the plague administrators—Colonel Creagh—for unwomanly conduct towards some unfortunate Rájá's wife. The only answer we got in the Bombay Legislative Council was that it would serve no good purpose to disclose the lady's name—(laughter)—and the Governor subsequently added that he had not seen Lord George Hamilton's statement to the effect that the elder Natu was put in prison for intimidating a midwife, thus suggesting that Lord George had opened his mouth too wide. Now this discloses a very serious state of things. These two men are still practically State prisoners. The Government has not been able to prove any sort of offence against them. You Englishmen, Scotchmen, Irishmen, and Welshmen are watching the terrible things taking place in France, where because certain officials are afraid to own to having made a mistake, a man is being kept in prison. When you talk about Dreyfus, remember that you have a Dreyfus case in India. (Hear, hear.) I ask you to use your influence to put an end to this sort of thing. I should not be here to-night did I not firmly believe that there is no wish or desire on the part of the Indian people to put an end to British rule in India. (Cheers.) I am here to-night to convey a message to English voters and to ask them to do their best to help those in India to put an end to a condition of things which otherwise may possibly in time put an end to British administration. (Hear, hear.) These things cannot go on. If you constantly tell the Indian people that they are seditious you will end by making them so, and that would be a most serious disaster for this country. Treat them as people like yourselves, as members of the British Empire. Let them have part and share in that empire of which they are as proud as yourselves. They like to feel that they are under the protection of your fleet and your army; that they are part of the empire. But if they feel that their part of the empire is that of Cinderella, that you are going to all the balls and having all the fun—(laughter)—they may fall into a sulky mood, and possibly in time become "sedition-mongers." I want you to play the part of the fairy godmother to Cinderella, to enable her to shake off her rags, and let her share the enjoyments which fall to your lot. (Loud heers.)

Letter from Mr. A. O. Hume.

The Chairman then read amid cheers the following letter from Mr. A. O. Hume:—

"The Chálet, 4, Kingswood Road, Upper Norwood, S.E.
"October 25, 1898.

"My dear Sir William,—I regret much that the state of my health still prevents my taking part in public meetings. I need not say how entirely I am in sympathy with the object of this coming meeting, which I understand to be to endeavour to draw public attention to the fact that all the troubles by which India has been recently beset are mainly due to the complete change of policy which has characterised the administration of that country during the past twelve or thirteen years.

"Lord Lytton's administration with its carefully planned aggression on Afghanistan, and its silly panic-struck attack on the one real boon of former and wiser rulers left to the people—the freedom of the Press—had cost thousands upon thousands of valuable lives, had utterly wasted millions upon millions of India's money, had disorganised the finances of the Empire and created the widest spread and deepest seated discontent amongst our Indian fellow-subjects, the *de jure* owners of our Indian Empire. Then came Lord Ripon, a true Liberal—saturated to the core with the Liberal axiom, 'Peace, economy, and reform.' He secured peace by returning to the sound and solid policy of Lords Lawrence and Mayo, where our neighbours were concerned, returning Kandahar despite the vapourings of the jingo military party (who have so successfully dominated Lord Elgin) to its rightful sovereign; he restored the equilibrium of our finances, so that ere he left India our budgets showed substantial surpluses, and he carried out reform in the only way any reform can be successful—by *trusting* the people. He once more made the Press free, and founded a system of local government *by* the people and *for* the people which as designed by him was capable of gradual and regular development into a complete system of representative government, without which *no* nation and *no* country can be rightly reckoned FREE!

"Never were the people of India more prosperous, more loyal to their Queen-Empress, or more happy and contented than when some fourteen years ago Lord Ripon's auspicious reign closed amid expressions of national gratitude and love, such as no other ruler of India ever secured.

"And *now*, look at India! a more unhappy land can hardly be found, and I fear none whose people are more thoroughly or more righteously dissatisfied with their rulers. And why? Because since Lord Ripon's time that evil policy of aggression abroad and repression at home, which Lord Ripon's liberal instincts revolted from, has become dominant in all later rulers' reigns, because they have given us ceaseless and unjust wars in lieu of *peace*; reckless and iniquitous military extravagance in lieu of *economy*; reactionary measures which recall some of the worst features of Russian despotism in lieu of *reform*, and setting aside Lord Ripon's unshaken, and, as the result proved, righteous *trust* in the people, have allowed suspicion and distrust of that people to reign supreme in their minds.

"You do well to try again and again to fix public attention on these facts, for thus far it seems as though, for us English, history for ever vainly writes her warnings upon the wall of time. I have grown old and weary in urging on my fellow countrymen the inevitable consequences of this wrong doing; but so surely as there is a divinity who shapes all mortal ends, who requites, slowly it may be but surely, all good and evil doing whether of individuals or nations, so surely shall poor England in some darkest hour of danger and distress have meted to her full retribution for all the wrongs done and now doing in her name to the people of India—a people the most loveable in the world, who need only fair play, justice and kindly trust to figure a generation hence as the premier bulwark of the Empire of which, if our present policy is persisted in, they *must* some day become the subverters.

"In the whole history of the world I know of nothing sadder than the dull apathy in regard to this vital issue which continues to prevail here. May it be your happier lot—I have toiled in vain—to awaken some real interest in this, which if rightly understood is the most momentous question that England has ever had to decide.

"The welfare, the destiny of nearly three hundred millions of people, and the persistence in the coming century of Great Britain as a first-class power are both involved.

"Yours very sincerely,
"A. O. Hume."

The Hon. Mark Napier.

The Hon. Mark Napier commented on the necessity for supplying English voters with fuller information regarding India, complimented the speakers on the moderation of their tone, and as the son of one who was Governor of Madras for many years expressed his sympathy with the movement and his belief that it was to the Liberal party they must look for redress. (Cheers.)

Mr. Romesh C. Dutt.

Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt pointed out that during her Majesty's reign there had been six disastrous famines in India involving the loss of many millions of lives, and he said that the land system was

responsible not for creating but for intensifying the effects of the famines. He then vigorously denounced the proposal of the Government to upset the system of self-government introduced twenty-two years ago by Lord Northbrook into the administration of the municipal affairs of Calcutta. He pointed out how under its beneficent working Calcutta had been made one of the healthiest places in malaria-stricken Bengal; and he protested against the intention to substitute for the present elective body a dozen nominated and paid commissioners who had no real and personal interest in the management of local affairs. He deplored this unsympathetic and reactionary policy, and in regard to the Government of India generally quoted the language of John Stuart Mill: "It is an inherent condition of human affairs that no intention however sincere of protecting the interests of others can make it safe or salutary to tie up their own hands." The people of India wanted and ought to have a voice in the management of their own affairs. (Hear, hear.)

MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI.

Mr. DADABHAI NAOROJI said the views stated that night as to the attitude of the educated Indians were authoritatively endorsed by Lord Ripon's Government in these words: "To the minds of at least the educated among the people of India—and the number is rapidly increasing—any idea of the subversion of the British power is abhorrent from the consciousness that it must result in the wildest anarchy and confusion." Why had the Government departed from that policy? Lord Ripon confirmed the belief of the people of India in the justice and truth of the British nation; his name would never be forgotten by the people, and the difference between the two governments was well described by Burke, who said: "The difference between a real statesman and a pretender is that one sees into the future while the other regards only the present. The one lives up to date and acts on expediency, the other acts on enduring principles and for immortality." Only idiots could think that the way to attach a people was to repress them; thistles would not bear grapes and injustice could not produce affection and satisfaction. (Cheers.) To use Lord Salisbury's own words: "Injustice will bring down the mighty to ruin." (Cheers.)

The resolution was then put and carried unanimously.

Mr. Ross in an eloquent speech moved a vote of thanks to the Chairman.

Mr. A. G. SYMONDS, in seconding, referred to the position he had held for twenty-five years as Secretary of the National Reform Union. He announced that arrangements had been made for Mr. Naoroji to deliver a course of twelve lectures in Lancashire on Indian affairs, and he hoped that this example would be widely followed, with the result that the English people would become better acquainted with the conditions under which their fellow subjects in India lived.

The compliment having been briefly acknowledged the proceedings were brought to a close.

THE KHYBER PASS.

DECLARATION TO THE AFRIDIS.

The *Times* of Friday last, October 21, gave prominence to the following statement:—

It should be clearly understood that the forthcoming declaration of the policy of the Government of India with reference to the Khyber Pass is essentially a declaration, and not in any way an agreement or proposition of terms. The standpoint from which the declaration will be made is the fact that the Afridis deliberately broke the former agreement to keep the pass open, into which they entered after the Afghan war, and that having broken it they must now be content to abide by the issue. The issue in question is that the Government of India will declare that it will henceforth retain the pass absolutely under its own control, and that the duty of providing the necessary military safeguard is no longer one in which the Afridis have any direct concern. The question whether the political control of the pass shall be transferred from the Punjab Government to the Government of India is one which for the present will remain in abeyance, as it is desirable that the new Viceroy should, after studying the question on the spot, have a voice in the ultimate decision. Pending a final arrangement, the relations with the tribes in this region will continue to be controlled by the Government of India, as they have been since the frontier troubles of last year.

The military future of the Pass has been definitely settled. The old system of a tribal levy under the orders of one British officer, who could be detached for other purposes, will be entirely discontinued. Its place will be taken by a new regiment of Afridi Militia, with a full complement of British officers, which will rank as an integral portion of the Indian Army. This corps will be under the orders of the Government of India, and will be on much the same footing as the Deoli, Erinpura, and other local forces. It will not in peace time be called upon to serve anywhere but in the Khyber Pass.

With regard to the Pass itself, the intention is to maintain a "place of arms" at Lundi Kotal, and to fortify it so strongly that at any time it will form a rallying point, which can be readily defended against a rising, however sudden and serious. Guns are to be placed in position, and sanction for these and for the necessary military works has already been given by the Secretary of State for India in Council. The former forts will be made good, but the main effort will be directed towards rendering Lundi Kotal a really strong defensive position. An important improvement is that up to Lundi Kotal the road will be made so smooth that it will always be easy to support the garrison by a movable column from Peshawar or elsewhere in the neighbourhood. This question of support is a new feature, and one upon which considerable stress is laid. The old Khyber Rifles, although paid by the Government of India, were regarded as the representatives of the Afridi tribe which covenanted to keep the Pass open, and accordingly there was no question involved of supporting the garrisons when they were "rushed" by their fellow-tribesmen. The case of the Afridi Militia will be altogether different, and the corps will hold Lundi Kotal in particular, and the Pass in general, on the understanding that it will be promptly and fully supported if occasion arises.

It has been decided not to station any British troops at Lundi Kotal for the present, but it is quite possible that this may be done hereafter. The Government of India reserves to itself the most absolute freedom in regard to this matter, as well as that of further fortifications, railway construction, or any other modification of the present arrangement, and this point will be very clearly impressed upon the Afridis in the forthcoming declaration.

A Reuter's telegram, dated Simla, October 22, was printed in Monday's newspapers (October 24), in the following terms:—

The following are the full terms of the settlement decided upon by the Government of India for the future control of the Khyber Pass, which are to be announced to the Afridi jirgas assembled at Peshawar on Monday:—

1. The Afridis, having ruptured their agreements and forfeited their allowances, have forced the Government to take and hold the Pass, which the Government will control as it thinks desirable.

2. The Pass shall be open to trade. A fort will be built at Lundi Kotal, with other forts between that place and Jamrud. A railway will be built if necessary. Offences committed in the vicinity will be punished.

3. The Afridis shall deal only with the British Government. They will manage the affairs of their own country, but in the Khyber they will be responsible to the Government, and shall co-operate in the preservation of order and security and the protection of life.

4. The Government will continue the allowances and will maintain a Militia recruited from the Afridis and other clans, which will be commanded by British officers. It will arrange for supports if troops are not always stationed at Lundi Kotal. It will make all arrangements regarding trade through the Khyber, which the Militia will guard.

5. The allowances will be commenced on the date the tribes adhere to the terms imposed, and will cease simultaneously with any misconduct on the part of the tribes in the Pass or against British allies.

The statement that the new Viceroy will decide as to the future political control of the Pass is incorrect.

Commenting on this declaration, the *Standard* wrote:—All that the Afridis have to decide is whether they will acquiesce in the new order of things, and make the most of it. To understand properly the nature of the terms offered them, reference must be made to the Agreement of February, 1881, which remained in force till the summer of last year, when the Afridis—to quote the Proclamation issued by Sir William Lockhart when he was starting on the Tirah Expedition—broke their engagements, plundered and burned the posts in the Khyber Pass, and joined the Orakzais in an attack on British forts and villages along the Kohat border. The first point to be noticed is the omission now of the clause recognising the independence of the Afridis, but qualified by the warning that they must not enter into any political relations with any other Power than Great Britain. The interdict is renewed, but no express mention is made of tribal independence. Nothing would be gained by keeping up the fiction. The sentimental theory that these border warriors are passionately resolved never to be the subjects of an alien ruler does not square with the facts. During the recent disturbances they offered to acknowledge the authority of the Amir Abdur Rahman. However, while the Indian Government thinks it unnecessary to retain the independence clause, the Afridis are promised a full measure of liberty outside the Khyber Pass. In the highlands of Tirah, in their winter quarters on the Upper Bara, and in Bazar, in the Alpine glen of Rajgal—everywhere in Afridiland except in the Khyber—they are left to manage their own affairs, or, rather, the affairs of their own country; for by clause three they are still prohibited from entering into relations with any other Power than the British Government of India. In regard to the Pass itself, however, their position in future will be one both of less freedom and less responsibility. Under the old stipulations, the Afridis, in return for certain allowances, undertook to maintain order along the Khyber, and it was agreed that all matters concerning Pass arrangements were to come before a general meeting of tribal representatives. The understanding, as expressed in official Reports, was that the road would be kept open "under the independent and exclusive charge of the tribes concerned." All this is now to be altered. The British Government itself will control the Khyber as it thinks desirable; it will build forts whenever they are wanted; it may possibly make a railway; and it will place the Khyber Militia under British officers. The Agreement of 1881 provided that the Khyber Musketeers, who afterwards rose to the dignity of Riflemen, were not to constitute a Government force. The Militia now to be

organised will, we must presume, come unmistakeably under this designation. There must never again be any doubt as to whether the Indian Government is bound to protect the men who fight and work for us. For the rest, the new Agreement presents no very striking features. If the Afridis are content, the allowances granted to them up to the time of the recent outbreak will be restored; and they will be permitted to enlist, as before, in the Khyber Rifles. But there is nothing which can be regarded as a marked and noticeable departure from the system prevailing hitherto, except for the intimation that the Khyber is now directly under British control. Nor until Lord Curzon has assumed the Viceroyalty, and has had time for consideration, are we likely to hear of any decided step in the direction of improved methods of frontier administration. Already, however, there are indications that a less adventurous policy and more moderate counsels find favour with the Government both in India and at home. Something may be inferred from the fact that the two Political Officers on the Malakand take furlough next year. In the Tochi Valley, Datta Khel is to be abandoned, and the military garrison is to be withdrawn to Miranshah. The Indian Government has also decided to postpone certain small extensions in the country further to the south. The scheme for transferring the management of the North-West Border from the Punjab Executive to the Calcutta Foreign Office has yet to take definite shape. There is, indeed, one measure which ought not to be deferred any longer—namely, the organisation of a moveable column at Peshawar; but this is a matter which may safely be left to Sir William Lockhart.

INDIA IN THE BRITISH PRESS.

LORD ELGIN'S ADMINISTRATION.

To become a successful administrator in India it was absolutely essential to observe two great principles—first, to uphold firmly law and order, and next to maintain a sympathetic and kind attitude towards native feeling and native wishes. The administrator who leant unduly to the first principle would be considered harsh, and to the second would be considered weak; but it was perfectly possible to reconcile the one principle with the other, and he was the best administrator who most fully succeeded in reconciling them.—*Sir Antony MacDonnell at the Hôtel Métropole, October* 15.

Nobody can read the farewell speech which Lord Elgin delivered a few days ago at the United Service Club at Simla without perceiving how uncommonly heavy have been the responsibilities and anxieties of his Viceroyalty. It may be doubted, as John Bright said, whether any human being is really equal, even in ordinary years, to the manifold and exacting duties of the head of the executive in India. And the years of Lord Elgin's Viceroyalty have been by no means ordinary. War, famine, and pestilence have followed one another in unbroken succession, each upon a scale which might well tax to the utmost the capacity and resources of any Government. In these circumstances Lord Elgin is not likely to claim in vain that critics among his own countrymen should temper their judgment upon any particular detail in his administrative record with a sympathetic recognition of the whole series of difficulties through which he has had to steer his course.

It is impossible not to see that there are current two widely divergent, if not flatly opposite, estimates of the way in which he has discharged his task. At home, and in the Anglo-Indian Press he is eulogised in terms which a Lawrence might have been proud to earn. On the other hand, he is accused by the representatives of educated Native opinion, not so much of calculated and deliberate misrule, as of habitual failure to give effect to his own excellent intentions by resisting the pressure put upon him by the military party in India and Lord George Hamilton at the India Office. He is said to have adopted the theory of the "mandate" in a new and extreme form, and to have so far obliterated his own authority as to become a mere figure-head at the other end of the telegraph-wire from Whitehall. According to this theory, when the Secretary of State and high officials in India praise Lord Elgin's foresight, discretion, and courage, they are, in actual fact, merely attributing those qualities to themselves.

It is perhaps too early in the day for impartial observers at home to attempt to decide how much truth is contained in either estimate. But those who, like ourselves, are anxious to recognise the difficulties that Lord Elgin has had to surmount cannot but regret such acts as the occupation of Chitral, the new legislation against public speaking and writing, the imprisonment of suspects without trial, and the present crusade against local municipal institutions. In fighting the famine, on the other hand, Lord Elgin and his subordinates exhibited a zeal which has won the praise even of their most persistent critics; and if, in the earlier days of the plague, measures were adopted which were little in accordance with Indian custom and feeling, it is satisfactory to know that a distinctly wiser policy has lately been substituted.

Interest, however, has now shifted from the bygones of Lord Elgin's administration to the qualities of his appointed successor. We should like to subscribe, if we could, to the high expectations of Lord Curzon's Viceroyalty which are entertained or expressed in some quarters. That he possesses in a conspicuous degree a certain ability nobody who knows anything of English party politics will deny. But it is a question, and a very grave question, too, whether Lord Curzon's ability is of the sort which goes to make a good Viceroy of India—whether, indeed, the very capacities which might have been counted to him for righteousness among his political associates in the House of Commons may not rather easily prove harmful at Simla. To-day, if ever, India deserves, as she needs, the best statesmanship which England can supply; and the type of statesman who is suited for the Viceroyalty is not a smart debater, or an audacious partisan, but above all else a good worker and a sober thinker, who will rely upon his own judgment, formed after a painstaking and impartial review of all the facts, and fortified by the opinion of his subordinates. We have quoted at the head of this article the wise words in which Sir Antony MacDonnell, the able and successful Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Provinces, describes the essential principles of Anglo-Indian administration. If Sir Antony is right, as we believe him to be, the virtue of an Indian Viceroy is what Aristotle says that all virtue is—a mean between two extremes. He must firmly uphold law and order without seeming to be harsh. He must be sympathetic towards Native feeling, without incurring a reputation for weakness. Are we likely to find this delicate combination of balanced qualities in the brilliant young gentleman whose airs and graces would have alienated if they had not amused the House of Commons? How is the annotator of Sir Claude MacDonald's syntax likely to conduct himself in the arduous routine of an Anglo-Indian official? Besides, we had always supposed it to be an article of the accepted creed that an Indian Viceroy, before his appointment, was not to be pledged to any particular party or policy in Indian affairs, but was to be able on his arrival in India to form an unprejudiced judgment in the spirit of a patient enquirer. That is what the quasi-official *Pioneer* of Allahabad meant when it dismissed the rumour that Mr. Curzon was likely to be appointed, "on the ground," as it wrote, "of public identification with pronounced opinions upon certain great questions of policy with regard to which it is of the utmost importance that the Viceroy should have an open mind."

One of the chief duties of a Viceroy at the present time is to resist the ill-considered schemes of the "high military mandarins," who, as Sir Henry Fowler pointed out at the beginning of the year, have a preponderating voice in the Viceroy's Council. But Lord Curzon, as his speeches and articles have abundantly shown, is more militarist than the military mandarins themselves. In the debate on Mr. Lawson Walton's amendment, when everybody, even Lord George Hamilton, was inclined to abandon the "forward" policy, Mr. Curzon permitted himself to say that "Russia has planted her soldiers right up to the waters of the Oxus, and we are equally bound to do the same." Mr. Thorburn's recent speech at Simla had no doubt the effect of exhibiting a remarkable volume of Anglo-Indian opinion hostile to the "forward" policy. Nor is that the only evidence which suggests that the recent war has taught an important lesson. But it is difficult to over-estimate the power for mischief which a Viceroy possesses in this direction. He is his own Foreign Minister. The circumstances of his official duties tend to turn his thoughts to the parts beyond the frontier. When a man of Lord Curzon's extreme views is placed in this position who can presume to forecast the consequences? There is another aspect of the matter which we cannot overlook. On account of the prominent place which frontier questions occupy in the attention of the Viceroy, other matters—matters, that is to say, connected with the internal administration of the country—are certain to be overlooked unless he is an extremely industrious man, in the enjoyment of robust health. It cannot be expected that Lord Curzon will fulfil these conditions if it be true, as one sees it stated, that one purpose of his going to India is to secure a change of air and lighter duties, after the hard work of an Under-Secretaryship at home! Yet no competent critic will deny that what India needs most is assiduous attention to the multitudinous details of internal administration. The great men who made the British Empire in India devoted themselves to domestic affairs, undisturbed by ambitious schemes of trans-frontier policy. One hears it said that Lord Curzon's appointment has been cordially approved in India. But that is not true without qualification. The *Pioneer*, for example, says:—

With all his extraordinary talents and admirable sentiments, it would be idle to pretend that Mr. Curzon's appointment will inspire the same confidence in all classes of the community as would that of a statesman whose reputation had ripened with a less phenomenal rapidity, and who had not been so quick to commit himself upon great questions of Indian policy in a fashion calculated to raise a doubt whether his political judgment is as mature as his imperial instinct is alert and eager.

So, too, the *Civil and Military Gazette* modifies its congratulations as follows:—

If it was not cavilling at the gifts of the gods, we could wish that so responsible a charge as that of the Indian Empire were committed to the riper judgment of a veteran who had won his spurs in government rather than in debate, and it seems to detract from the dignity of this high office that it should become a politician's first essay in administration.

And this, be it remembered, is not Indian but Anglo-Indian criticism.—*The Daily Chronicle.*

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

OFFICERS IN INDIA.

President (elected 1897):
Hon. C. SANKARAN NAIR.

General Secretary:
A. O. HUME, C.B., Rothney Castle, Simla; and The Chalet, Upper Norwood, S.E.

Joint General Secretary (in India):
D. E. WACHA, 84, Hornby Row, Bombay.

Standing Counsel:
Bengal, W. C. BONNERJEE;
Bombay, PHEROZSHAH MEHTA;
Madras, RAI BAHADUR ANANDU CHARLU.

BRITISH COMMITTEE.

Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart., M.P., *Chairman*.
W. C. Bonnerjee.
W. S. Caine.
W. A. Chambers.
G. B. Clark, M.P.
A. O. Hume, C.B.
J. Seymour Keay.
H. S. Khalil.
Sarat Mullick.
Dadabhai Naoroji.
J. Herbert Roberts, M.P.
C. E. Schwann, M.P.
Robinson Souttar, M.P.
Alfred Webb.
W. Martin Wood.

Offices: 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Telegraphic Address: "Incas, London."

Name of Circle.	Jurisdiction.	Name and Address of Secretary or Secretaries.
1. Calcutta	Presidency, Burdwan and Chittagong Divisions (*except* Murshidabad District) Assam & Orissa	J. Ghosal, Esq., Nolin Behari Sircar, Esq., and Raja Binoy Krishna Deb Bahadur, 11, Clive Street, Calcutta.
2. Dacca	Dacca District	Babu Sarat Chandra Bose, Pleader, Rajar Deory, Dacca.
3. Maimansingh ...	Maimansingh District	Babu Anath Bandhu Guha, Sec., Maimansingh Association, Maimansingh.
4. Faridpur	Faridpur District	Babu Ambica Churn Mozumdar, Pleader, Faridpur.
5. Barisal	Bakarganj District	Babu Awsini Kumar Dutt, Pleader, Barisal.
6. Rangpur	Rangpur District	Joges Chandra Das Gupta, Pleader, Rangpur.
7. Dinajpur	Dinajpur District	Babu Lalit Chandra Sen, B.A., B.L., Dinajpur.
8. Pabna...	Pabna District	Babu Harendra Narain Roy, B.L., Pabna.
9. Bogra	Bogra District	Babu Peary Sunker Das Gupta, L.M.S., Medical Practitioner, Bogra.
10. Jalpaiguri	Jalpaiguri District	Babu Umagati Roy, Jalpaiguri.
11. Rampur-Beauleah ...	Rajshahyi District	Dr. Chandra Nath Chowdry, Rampur-Beauleah.
12. Berhampur	Murshidabad District	Babu Boikunt Nath Sen, Berhampur, Dist. Murshidabad.
13. Bhagalpur	Bhagalpur Division (*except* Purneah District) ...	Babus Siva Sankar Sahai and Surya Prosad, Bhagalpur.
14. Purneah	Purneah District	Babu Jogendra Nath Mukerji, Pleader, Purneah.
15. Chutia-Nagpur ...	Chutia-Nagpur Division	Rai Jodu Nath Mukerji, Pleader, Hazaribagh.
16. Behar	Patna Division (excluding the Muzaffarpur and Gaya Districts)	Babu Banwari Lal, Patna City.
17. Muzaffarpur ...	Muzaffarpur District...	Babu Preo Nath Mukherji, B.L., Vakil, Muzaffarpur.
18. Gaya	Gaya District	Babus Nand Kishore Lal and Upendra Chandra Mittra, Gaya.
19. N.-W. Provinces ..	North-Western Provinces	Secretary, Standing Committee, Johnstonganj, Allahabad.
Sub-divisions of the	*N. W. P. for the purpose of distributing* "India."	
Name of Sub-division.	Jurisdiction.	
Gorakhpur ...	Gorakhpur Division	A. Nundy, Esq., Gorakhpur.
Benares	Benares Division (*except* Mirzapur District) ...	Pandit Channu Lal, Benares City.
Mirzapur	Mirzapur District	Babu Sri Ram, Mirzapur.
Cawnpur	Cawnpur District	Pandit Perthi Nath, Cawnpur.
Bareilly	Bareilly District	The Secretary, Congress Committee, Bareilly.
Moradabad ...	Moradabad District	N. C. Bose, Esq., Moradabad.
Saharanpur ...	Saharanpur District	Babu Anand Swarupa, B.A., LL.B., Vakil, Saharanpur.
Meerut	Meerut District	Babu Prahlad Singh, Meerut.
Aligarh	Aligarh District	Hafiz M. Abdur Rahim, Esq., Aligarh.
Agra	Agra Division	Pandit Tulsi Ram Misra, Mursan, Dist. Aligarh.
Allahabad ...	All places in the N.W.P. not above enumerated	Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Sec. for the N.-W. P. Circle, Allahabad.
20. Oudh	Oudh	Munshi Ganga Prasad Varma, Office of the *Advocate*, Lucknow.
21. Punjab	The Punjab	Lala Jrishi Ram, Secretary, Congress Committee, Lahore; Babu Chetan Anand, Multan; Bhagat Ram, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, Jalandhar City; Lala Murli Dhar, Pleader, Ambala City; Babu Kedar Nath, Pleader, Delhi; and Pandit Perthi Nath, Pleader, Peshawur.
22. Bombay	Bombay Island, Colaba, Thana & Ratnagiri Dists.	D. E. Wacha, Esq., Presidency Association, Bombay.
23. Sind	Sind	Tahilram Khemchand, Esq., Pleader, Karachi; Himatsing G. Advani, Esq., Shikarpur and Hiranand Khemsing, Esq., Haidarabad.
24. Ahmedabad	Ahmedabad, Kaira and Panch Mahals Districts, Cutch and Kathiawar, Rajkot	Rao Saheb Kesavalal Motilal and Ratanlal Ranchhoddas, B.A., Pleaders, Ahmedabad.
25. Surat	Surat and Broach Districts, with Baroda ...	Hardevram Nanabhai Haridas, Esq., and Bhagubai Dayabhai, Esq., Surat.
26. Sholapur	Sholapur District	Vishem R. Lele, Esq., Sholapur.
27. Bijapur	Bijapur District	Krishnaji Raghunath Natu, Esq., B.A., LL.B., Bijapur.
28. Dharwar	Dharwar District	Sec., Standing Congress Committee, Dharwar, and Raghunath A. Sule, Esq., Hubli.
29. Satara	Satara District	Raghunath Pandurang Karandikar, Esq., High Court Pleader, Satara.
30. Ahmadnagar ...	Ahmadnagar District	Shankar Gangadhar Ranade, Mohenlal Hiralal and Kashinath Vinayak Bhawe, Pleaders, Ahmadnagar.
31. Poona	Poona, Nasik, & Khandesh Districts	Laxuman Raghunath Gokhale, Esq., Pleader, Poona.
32. Ichalkaranji... ...	Southern Mahratta Country	Sadashiv Ramchandra Apte, Ichalkaranji, near Kolhapur, S.M. Country.
33. Berar	Berar	R. N. Mudholkar, Esq., and B. H. Karandikar, Esq., Pleaders, High Court, Amraoti.
34. Nagpur	Central Provinces	Kesava Gopal Tamhan, M.A., Morris College, Nagpur.
35. Madras	Madras, Chingleput, N. and S. Arcot, Nellore and Native States	M.r.ry. V. Ryru Nambiar, High Court Vakil, Madras; M.r.ry. S. H. Belgrami, Barrister-at-Law, Madras, Secs., Mahajana Sabha.
36. Madura	Madura and Tinnevelli	M.r.ry. G. Srinivasa Row Garu, Pleader, Madura; M.r.ry. K. R. Gurusami Iyer, District [Court Pleader, Tinnevelli.
37. Tanjore	Tanjore and Trichinopoli	M.r.ry. S. Ramachandra Iyer Aol, High Court Vakil, Tanjore; M.r.ry. K. Vasudeva Iyengar, Mirasidar, Srirangam; M.r.ry. N. Vydianadha Iyer, M.A., Kumbakonum; M.r.ry. P. Rathna Sabapathy Pillai, Pleader, Negapatam.
38. Bellary	Bellary, Anantapur, Cuddapah, and Karnul ...	M.r.ry. Srinivasa Row Garu, B.A., Pleader, Bellary; M.r.ry. Dhone Subba Row Garu, Pensioned Deputy Tahsildar, Karnul.; Hon. Rai Bahadur C. Jambulinga Mudaliar, B.A., M.L., Cuddapah; M.r.ry. P. Kesava Pillai, Pleader, Gooty.
39. Malabar	Malabar and Kanara...	Hon. C. Sankara Nair, Poonamalli Road, Egmore, Madras; M.r.ry. K. C. Manavikraman Raja, Secretary, Kerala Mahajana Sabha, Calicut; M.r.ry. T. Viraraghava Iyer, Palghat; M.r.ry. T. C. Naraina Kurup, High Court Vakil, Tellicheri; Rao Bahadur N. Shiva Row, Pleader, Mangalore.
40. Salem	Salem	Hon. C. Vijiaraghava Chariar, B.A., Pleader, Salem.
41. Coimbatore	Coimbatore and Nilghiris	M.r.ry. C. M. Padmanabha Chariar, B.A., B.L., Coimbatore.
42. Ganjam	Ganjam, Vizagapatam, Godavari, and Kristna	M.r.ry. B. Surianarayana Rao Garu, Vizagapatam; M.r.ry. C. Rungachariar, High Court Vakil, Musulipatam; M.r.ry. D. Subramaniem, Pleader, Coconada.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.—Intending Subscribers to "India" should communicate with the gentleman whose name appears as Secretary to the Congress Committee for the district in which they reside, or with the London Office. All the gentlemen so named are in monthly correspondence with England, and receive a certain number of spare copies of "India" to enable them to obtain new Subscribers, and are authorised to receive subscriptions to the Journal, which are payable in advance. They will also from time to time transmit to London the names of Subscribers who have paid, so that all such Subscribers may receive their copies direct from England every week. Subscribers are requested in giving notice of any alteration in their address, to quote the number on the covering wrapper of their copies of "India."

TO ADVERTISERS.—Intending Advertisers should apply for terms to any of the following: The Manager, "India," 84, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W.; The Secretaries, Calcutta Congress Committee Offices, 11, Clive Street, Calcutta; D. E. Wacha, Esq., Presidency Association, Bombay; The Secretaries, Mahajana Sabha, Madras; Jrisha Ram, Esq., Secretary Congress Committee, Lahore; Secretary, Congress Committee, Johnstonganj, Allahabad.

JUST PUBLISHED.

With Maps, Plans, Portraits, and Illustrations, 8vo, 8/6 net.

THE CAMPAIGN IN TIRAH 1897-98.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE EXPEDITION AGAINST THE ORAKZAIS AND AFRIDIS UNDER GENERAL SIR WILLIAM LOCKHART, G.C.B., K.C.S.I.

Based (by permission) on Letters contributed to the TIMES,

By COLONEL H. D. HUTCHINSON,
Director of Military Education in India.

DAILY CHRONICLE.—"We are not sure that his very carefully compiled and very well written work will not ultimately rank as the best account of this our finest instance of mountain warfare. . . . . Must be a real pleasure to all students of military history."

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED, LONDON.

NOW READY.

Price One Shilling and Sixpence, net. In India, 1 Rupee.

CONGRESS GREEN-BOOK: No. 2.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

EVIDENCE-IN-CHIEF OF THE FIVE INDIAN WITNESSES.

Large foolscap, 116 pp.

Published by the
British Committee of the Indian National Congress,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

This Volume may be also obtained from the Secretaries of the Standing Congress Committees at Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras. Remittances should accompany application.

N.B.—The postage of each copy is 4d., in addition to the price stated above.

6d. Weekly.]

THE "HOME NEWS"

Is the BEST SUMMARY of EUROPEAN INTELLIGENCE
SPECIALLY PREPARED FOR
INDIA, CEYLON, CHINA, and AUSTRALASIA.
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY.

THE "HOME NEWS" Will keep readers posted up in all Political, Social, Literary, Dramatic, and other movements.

THE "HOME NEWS" Contains Original and Special Matter, and gives the cream of the European Newspapers.

Ask the Local Newsagent to get it, or send Subscription direct to the Publisher.

Subscription, including postage, payable in advance—

Period.	All places abroad.	In United Kingdom.
Three Months...	£0 7 7	£0 7 1
Six Months	0 15 9	0 14 1
One Year	1 10 4	1 8 2

Cheques and P.O. Orders to be made to the order of Grindlay & Co.

Offices: 56, PARLIAMENT STREET, LONDON, S.W.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS: ITS AIMS AND JUSTIFICATION.

[Being a reprint of certain articles on the subject in the *Statesman and Friend of India.*]

By ROBERT KNIGHT.

Calcutta: Published at the *Statesman* Office.

The above will be sent to any address on receipt of 1d. stamp for postage. Application should be made to the Manager of "India," 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

Dr. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., New Medical Hall, Meerut.

TOOTH-ACHE

CURED INSTANTLY BY

BUNTER'S Prevents Decay, Saves Extraction. Sleepless Nights Prevented.

Neuralgic Headaches and all Nerve Pains removed by BUNTERS NERVINE. All Chemists, 1s. 1½d.

NERVINE

is what its name implies **FEVER DESTROYER,**

and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER know.
C. E. Wood, Capt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. Narsinga Row.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I have much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage,
C. S. Srinivasa, Chairman.

Omum-Carpoor TRADE MARK

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., 1 Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY, 43, King William St., London, E.C., and 27, Second Line Beach, Madras.

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

Applications for rates for Advertisements in "India," should be made to

The Manager,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers,
Westminster, S.W.

Advertisements should reach the Office not later than first post on Thursday in order to ensure insertion in the issue of the following day.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager *of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliot Stock, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. Bonner, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.